

546-1092-87
325 copies

JPRS-UPS-87-015

5 MARCH 1987

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

5 MARCH 1987

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

January Plenum Discussion of Electoral System Reviewed (Editorial; IZVESTIYA, 3 Feb 87)	1
RSFSR Paper Views Central Committee Plenum (Editorial; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 31 Jan 87)	4
PRAVDA Reports Party Purge in Krasnodar (K. Aksenov; PRAVDA, 27 Jan 87)	11
Georgian CP Central Committee Meetings Discussed (ZARYA VOSTOKA, various dates)	15
Officials Removed From CPSU Ranks	15
Media Campaign on Production	17
Estonian Construction Minister Charged To Increase Tempo (RAHVA HAAL, 4 Dec 86)	19
Courts Directed To Increase Pressure on Alcohol Offenses (RAHVA HAAL, 28 Nov 86)	20

HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

IZVESTIYA Surveys Lenin's Writings on Administration, Managers (Georgiy Melikyants; IZVESTIYA, 21 Jan 87)	21
Review of Soviet TV Series on Lenin (Aleksandr Svodobin; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 24 Jan 87)	26

RELIGION

PRAVDA Complains of Failings in Atheist Education (A. Tursumov; PRAVDA, 16 Jan 87)	27
---	----

RSFSR Paper Carries Feature on Atheism (I. Dyakov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 18 Jan 87)	34
Commentator Examines 'Danger' of Religious Sects (Vladimir Molchanov; Moscow Television Service, 23 Jan 87)	36
Briefs Uzbeks Expelled for Religious Activities	37
CULTURE	
TV Studio Cancels Second Showing of Controversial Film (MOSCOW NEWS, No 4, 1-8 Feb 87)	38
Literary Critics Call for 'Genuine Free Speech' (Igor Dedkov; MOSCOW NEWS, No 4, 1-8 Feb 87)	40
Writers Union Condemns Official Neglect of Kazakh Past (QAZAQ ADEBIYATI, 21 Nov 86)	41
Aytmatov Addresses All-Union Onomastics Conference (S. Atanyyazov, B. Veyisov; SOVET TURKMENISTANY, 30 Oct 86)	46
National Theater Neglects Revolution, Workers (SOVET TURKMENISTANY, 26 Oct 86)	46
Estonia Opens First Video Store (IZVESTIYA, 27 Dec 86)	47
SOCIAL ISSUES	
MOSCOW NEWS Article on Restructuring (Aleksandr Levikov; MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, No 5, 1 Feb 87) ..	48
USSR Justice Minister Addresses Readers' Concerns (B. V. Kravtsov Interview; CHELOVEK I ZAKON, No 1, Jan 87) ..	53
MOSCOW NEWS Reports on Entry, Exit Visa System (Andrey Muratov; MOSCOW NEWS, No 4, 25 Jan 87)	62
Lax Penalties in 1982 Ukraine Corruption Case Exposed (Yuriy Shchekochikhin; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 28 Jan 87) ..	66
Academics Rapped for Shunning Study of Bureaucracy (V. Kosyakov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 4 Jan 87)	75
REGIONAL ISSUES	
Moldavia's Mokuanu Answers IZVESTIYA Article on MSSR Corruption (A. Mokuanu; IZVESTIYA, 25 Jan 87)	77
Estonian Describes Trial of War Criminals (RAHVA HAAL, 4 Dec 86)	81

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

JANUARY PLENUM DISCUSSION OF ELECTORAL SYSTEM REVIEWED

PM031415 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The CPSU Central Committee Planum on Enhancing the Role of Soviets"]

[Text] The party and the people link the future prospects for our society's development with the restructuring process. We have no other path--this idea was clearly expressed at the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum. When speaking about restructuring and the connected processes of the profound democratization of society, we have in mind truly revolutionary and comprehensive transformations in society.

These transformations affect all spheres of the socialist state's activity and, of course, Soviets of people's deputies. Present-day conditions give special significance to Lenin's words about the marvelous means capable of increasing tenfold the strength of the state apparatus, namely, the vital creativity of the masses directly involved in the administration of the country. And when directing us toward resolving the paramount tasks, the party now attaches great significance to the all-around development of the democratic nature of the Soviet system, the democratization of the process of the formation and functioning of organs of state power, the enhancement of the Soviets' role in economic and social building, and the people's real and increasingly active participation in resolving all the questions of the country's life.

The improvement of the Soviet electoral system is the fundamental direction in the solution of this problem. In ridding the practice of the nomination and discussion of prospective Soviet deputies of elements of formalism and providing the voter with the opportunity to express his attitude on a large number of candidates and to participate effectively in all stages of the electoral process the party and the state is thus creating major preconditions for increasing the effective work of the organs of people's power.

The electoral system, like all political, economic, and social institutions, must not stagnate or stand aside from the new processes developing in society. That is why, as the plenum stressed, we must take care to ensure that this very year the election campaign proceeds in an atmosphere of broader democracy and people's committed involvement in this process.

Such an approach to the formation of the organs of power will ensure citizens' real participation in the management of the affairs of society and the state and will give voters broad powers to monitor Soviets' activity. Present-day conditions give fundamental significance to raising the level and enhancing the effectiveness of monitoring "from below" to ensure, as the CPSU Central Committee plenum noted, that "every leader and every official is constantly aware of his responsibility to and dependence on the voters, labor collectives, social organizations, the party, and the people as a whole."

With these aims in mind it is necessary to strictly observe the rules of the regular accountability of all elected and appointed officials to labor collectives and the population. Soviets have tremendous potential for such monitoring. Supreme and local Soviets must strengthen the democratic principles of the work of sessions, standing commissions, and deputies and enhance the responsibility of officials to make regular reports to Soviets and of the practice of deputies' questions. "Such an approach," the plenum said, "will consolidate even more the prestige of the organs of people's power amount the masses."

This will also be the practical fulfillment of Lenin's demand that the work of elective organs should be open to all and should be carried out in full view of the masses.

It goes without saying that by no means all Soviet workers everywhere have perceived the ideas of restructuring as a call to urgent work and in some places are slow if not downright unwilling to rid themselves of the burden of old habits and ideas. A whole series of local Soviets still set much store by the formalistic and bureaucratic style of working, that is, a style which was given an unambiguous and negative appraisal by the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum and the 27th Party Congress. The first steps of restructuring and its first results are now becoming increasingly significant.

Rayon and city Soviet sessions are being held in a new way in Moscow, Ulyanovsk, and Sverdlovsk. Many local Soviets in Belorussia are working in an atmosphere of broad openness. Real practical steps in Estonia's economic development have been taken by the republic's organs of power and management. Ispolkom leaders' reports at gatherings and labor collective meetings, an efficient system of monitoring the fulfillment of decisions, in short, all manifestations of the new thinking and actions now deserve not only attention but also extensive universal dissemination.

This is especially important since in conditions of restructuring local Soviets have an increasing role in developing territories under their jurisdiction and in improving their infrastructure. The resolution of that task is the purpose of the well known CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers resolution adopted last year on enhancing the role and increasing the responsibility of Soviets, a resolution which gave local organs of power extensive authority to accelerate the socioeconomic development of the regions and above all to resolve social questions. This sets Soviets the task of making fuller use of their economic and juridical rights in the management of territories, rights granted to them under the law. Those rights include ensuring that the contribution by

enterprises and organizations to local Soviets' funds for the solution of social questions is efficiently carried out as well as the right to rescind or suspend unlawful orders and instructions issued by departmental administrations.

Competence and a responsible attitude to assignments and to people's needs and requests—those are the qualities that are now coming to the forefront. And this is most closely linked with the crucial problem of restructuring and with the problem of the selection, placement, and training of local Soviets' cadres.

The four lessons of cadre policy in recent years that were cited by the plenum also apply fully to Soviet cadres. The inordinate growth of the role of executive organs to the detriment of elective organs, the overformalized work of sessions where secondary questions or questions that have already been resolved are discussed, and the lack of proper monitoring of the activity of ispolkoms and their leading cadres—all this has slowed down the development of Soviets as organs of people's power and created an imbalance between the executive organ and even between its apparatus and the Soviet. Consequently the role of Soviet deputies in the formation of ispolkoms, the selection of cadres, and the monitoring of their activity has been reduced.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum set the task of enhancing the role of elective organs and creating the necessary legal and political guarantees for ensuring Soviets' effective monitoring of the activity of ispolkoms and their apparatus. "We are all interested," the plenum said, "in ensuring that Soviets begin working properly sooner and in the spirit of the times."

Local organs of power have quite a lot to do. The measures outlined by the party require effective and determined actions from Soviets. Soviet people expect that from them.

/12913

CSO: 1800/307

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

RSFSR PAPER VIEWS CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

PM031113 Mosccw SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 Jan 87 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Revolutionary Renewal"; passages between slantlines published in italics]

[Text] April 1985. February 1986. January 1987. In the Soviet history of socialism these dates mark a frontier as important as socialism's very inception. In these 20 months the pivotal course of the April Plenum and the 27th congress which reliably defined our people's future and the very destiny of socialism has become the linchpin of our life and has gained a broad perspective.

The January plenum has only just completed its work. This was an event of enormous importance not only in terms of its political importance and decisive consequences but also in terms of its spirit. The headquarters of Lenin's party set an example of a Leninist approach toward the examination of the fundamental, most burning issues of party practice and socialist existence. There reigned here a creative spirit, revolutionary thinking, bolshevik conviction, and undivided responsibility. The report of M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "on restructuring and the party's cadres policy" was discussed in a committed, comprehensive, and frank manner and was unanimously welcomed as a document arming us with an uncompromising historical analysis, a theoretical substantiation of the restructuring process which is developing, and radical principles for the strategic course toward the acceleration of socioeconomic development and the transformation of all aspects of our society's life.

This plenum has given mature and wise answers to many questions which were still open. These days you can unfailingly hear from eminent platforms, in the plant shop, and in the family council sincere approval and gratitude: The party leadership knows the real state of affairs, can see the real problems of our life, is finding fair solutions to them, and is boldly setting tasks. Public opinion in the country and abroad confirms that our party is emerging from this January even more cohesive—strong in truth and honor, mind and action.

The country has behind it the path of more than one October generation. From the heights of 7 decades we can clearly see the pinnacles of socialism which

have been erected with their unfading beacons. And the year since the congress is already imparting marked material form to the effect of restructuring. Must we carry out a postmortem on the pre-April stage? We must! the Central Committee says. We must see completely the reasons for stagnation, investigate in detail the braking mechanism which halted our progress in the late seventies and early eighties. We know more now and have a more realistic idea of the magnitude of the calamities which threatened us. We must honestly analyze the errors and contradictions so that they are clearer to those who do not fully understand or have doubts, in order to rule out utterly the possibility of their repetition. V. I. Lenin taught that we must rectify errors /by attentively investigating their significance./ And if we do repeat political errors /then all economic building will be curtailed and then we will have to engage in disputes on rectification and orientation./

Analyzing the dramatic state of the economy of the preceding period and the situation in the social and spiritual spheres, the Central Committee concludes that conservative sentiments and an irresponsible departure from the problems set by life prevailed in the policy and practical activity of the past. In 15 whole years, one speech emphasized, essentially only three questions were submitted for discussion at plenums: the next plan, agriculture, and the international situation. Other questions were removed from the agenda because of the complexity of resolving them.

This isolation from life and the slackening of attention toward the development of theoretical thinking and the study of socialism's motive forces and contradictions led to a simplistic interpretation of Lenin's provisions on socialism and description of concepts like public ownership, class and international [mezhnatsionalnyye] relations, and control over the degree of labor and consumption...

The stagnation phenomena in theory had an adverse effect on social practice. Economic relations were not brought into line with society's real maturity. Obsolete methods of management were current. Production and labor incentives were geared to quantitative, extensive development. Unjustified prejudices concerning the operation of some economic laws and the real levers of economic management opened up scope for voluntarist approaches, undermined incentives to high end results in production, and led to the reduction of people's labor and social activeness. The distortion of genuine ideas about who can be in charge of socialist ownership and how generated departmental and localistic erosion of this ownership and made unearned incomes easily accessible.

Many party organizations, the Central Committee plenum stressed, were unable to hold on to their principled positions, failed to pay the necessary attention to the strict observance of Lenin's principles and norms of party life, and failed to wage a resolute struggle against negative phenomena, against the slackening of discipline and the dissemination of drunkenness, and against embezzlements and bribe-taking. A proper rebuff was not always dealt to departmentalism and localistic tendencies and nationalist manifestations.

It is no accident that Lenin's words describing some pseudo-leaders who, when they take over management, cannot keep hold of the helm, were heard from the plenum rostrum. /The vehicle is wrested from their hands as though the driver is sitting in it but the vehicle is going not where it is being pointed but where someone is directing it.../ Turning to the practice of the recent past and generalizing their personal observations and their own experience of the struggle, those taking part in the plenum directly link the crisis phenomena with serious flaws in cadres policy and see the reciprocal influence of cause and effect.

On this specific issue and in literally every proposition the voice of the people merges with the voice of the party plenum. Those who mounted the eminent platform turned repeatedly to the working people's thoughts and feelings and to the letters collected in a workbook for the plenum participants.

From our mail:

"The style of work of the overwhelming majority of party, soviet, and economic leaders was worked out under the conditions of the development of an extensive economy. Hence the illiterate, incompetent, sometimes primitive approach toward the leadership ('I said: Do it') of the collectives, the autocratic (verging on voluntarist) methods of management, the technocratic approach toward the solution of the managerial problems which arise, the failure to understand the paramount importance of social and political factors, bureaucracy, rudeness, moral deafness, and so forth; leaders like that are punished and dismissed in hundreds but new ones appear... But the whole point is that leaders must be chosen correctly, with a consideration for the scientific methods elaborated long ago and, the main thing, they must be taught, taught thoroughly, and retaught on a state scale and locally. All of them!" (V. S. Vasilyev, Saratov)

The April course and the decisions of the party congress indicated a way out of the difficult, crisis situation--/RESTRUCTURING/ [uppercased word between slantlines published in capitals]. Only restructuring can cast off the fetters of stagnation and lead society to a qualitatively new level of development.

/IT IS NOT FOR NOTHING/ [uppercased words between slantlines published in capitals] that M. S. Gorbachev's report at the January plenum has been called the theoretical foundations of restructuring. Indeed, it is the first time that the entire party strategy of restructuring with its definition of its main purport and ultimate goal, its nature and the forces which comprise it, has been revealed so fully and with such internal logic, so thoroughly and consistently. The party now has a document giving an all-around substantiation for its actions.

What does accomplishing restructuring mean? Put concisely it means:

- Resolutely overcoming stagnation processes, scrapping the braking mechanism, and creating an effective mechanism for accelerating social development. The real pooling of the supreme achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the planned economy will bring socialism's entire potential fully into operation;
- Safely putting our trust in the masses' creativity, in the working levers of democracy, and in living socialist self-management. We must arouse initiative and enterprise, discipline and order, openness and criticism everywhere. The self-revelation of the individual presupposes respect for its values and dignity;
- Steadily enhancing the role of intensive factors in the development of the economy, asserting Lenin's principles of democratic centralism in management, giving priority to economic methods, abandoning domineering, administrative methods; introducing full financial autonomy and new forms of organizing labor; encouraging innovation and socialist enterprise;
- Doing everything to consolidate the production partnership of science and practice for the sake of the highest end results; being able to put a good undertaking on a firm scientific footing; displaying tireless concern for the constant growth of science and its cadres;
- Constantly seeking priority for the social sphere and satisfying people's requirements increasingly fully, displaying special concern for supplementing spiritual resources; being able to combine fundamental transformations with the solution of current questions which perturb people;
- Consistently implementing the principles of socialist justice; asserting the unity of word and deed and of rights and obligations; extolling the authority of honest labor, vigorously overcoming consumerism, leveling down, and all kinds of distortions of socialist morality.

A vast panorama of the restructuring which has begun and of positive advances in economic and social development is revealed in broad brush strokes in the report and supplemented by nearly every speaker. These were confident but always restrained assessments. In their deliberations the plenum participants frequently corrected themselves: "More dynamically, no, somewhat more dynamically," "More was achieved than planned, but far less than required..." This is not only a tribute to realism but also an understanding that we are at the very start of restructuring.

From our mail:

"Some party workers are obviously dismayed today. They do not entirely understand the thrust of restructuring and have not defined their own place in it. They understand one thing: Power is being taken from them. In other words, they are not being allowed to work with their old methods. And they

know no new methods because they have not been prepared for professional party work." (B. D. Nikitenko, Izmail)

The Central Committee plenum was heard confidently to state that restructuring is no longer simply an idea or intention, it is reality. The business of restructuring is irreversible. It is supported nationwide. It is becoming the thrust of revolutionary renewal. Restructuring is a great school for millions of people. We must do well at this school.

/IN DEVINING/ [uppercased words between slantlines published in capitals] the course of renewal and developing the nationwide cause of restructuring the party understands more clearly than ever the profound content of Lenin's idea of the natural link between socialism and democracy. Living, genuine socialism is the creation of the people's masses themselves and the business of the minds and hands of millions. That means that the maximum amount of democracy leads to an abundance of the fruits of social and ensures their qualitative reproduction.

It is perfectly right that the January plenum gave pride of place to the intensification of the democracy of Soviet society as a very important issue. It was repeatedly emphasized that only through democracy and thanks to democracy is restructuring possible.

From the mail:

"V. I. Lenin wrote: 'The proletariat...when he sees evil sets about combatting it in a businesslike manner, supports openly and officially the candidacy of the good worker Ivan and proposes replacing the bad worker Petr, and when he starts something he sees it through vigorously and firmly--be it against the rogue Sidor, against Tit's protectionist venture, or against Miron's criminal deal...' We must not overlook this social feature of the working class so valuable under present conditions too." (A. A. Agapova, Moscow Oblast)

"I shall be frank: I have neither the strength nor the desire to look at some 'leaders.' Their most intolerable quality is disrespect for the worker's labor, disregard for the laws. Give us the right, and such leaders will rapidly disappear. Have no fear that we will let you down." (V. V. Shipilov, Sevastopol)

The plenum gave the warmest support to the provisions of the report on the development of democracy in the production sphere and the consistent introduction of self-management into the labor collectives' lives. And this support was given above all in the speeches by representatives of the working class and kolkhoz peasantry--V. S. Kostin, leader of a team of Prokopyevsk miners, Moscow lathe operator V. P. Tikhomirov, V. N. Golubeva, director of the Ivanovo textile factory, and D. K. Motornyy, director of a Kheason kolkhoz.

The plenum decreed that it must be deemed essential to introduce appointment by election for the leaders of enterprises, production facilities, shops, sections, sectors, stock raising units, and links, and team leaders and foremen. The practice of using the competition system for selecting and replacing leaders and specialists must be expanded and its conditions must be defined.

The improvement of the Soviet electoral system is an important step on the path of democratizing society's entire life. The plenum resolutely expressed itself in favor of the practice of forming soviets and the actual procedure for electing people's deputies being rid of elements of formalism and in favor of the voter being able to express his attitude toward a large number of candidates and take a real, conscious part in all stages of the electoral process. The new phase of democracy must show itself effectively as early as this year. And subsequently the party, in considering and developing Lenin's legacy in the field of Soviet state building, will lead society toward deeper changes.

The party also examines questions of the development of its own internal democracy within the mainstream of democratization. The necessary steps will be taken to improve the mechanism of the formation of the party's leading organs to create conditions for Communists to express their will extensively in the election process, and to ensure an active influx of fresh forces. Control "from below," regular accountability, and other measures must make the work of the elected organs and of leaders at different levels open to all.

Widespread openness, criticism and self-criticism, the control of the masses must become constant working instruments--the most reliable instruments--of both party democracy and our entire democracy. The people have an interest in everything in their socialist house. They must know everything and judge everything in an aware manner. These passionate words of Lenin's uttered in the first days of the October revolution have an ardent, topical, challenging ring today too.

The party links the entire vast bulk of restructuring and the entire transformation of society with the successful pursuit of Lenin's cadres policy. Vladimir Ilich's advice is more timely than ever here and his appeals and warnings are more urgent than ever... /We have reached the conclusion that the crux of the situation lies in people, in the selection of people... Select the people you need and verify practical execution--and the people will assess it.../ If necessary--/restructure the ranks accordingly./ It is even more reliable to derive organizational talents from below, from the workers: /They have more strength, freshness, directness, hardness, and sincerity than other people./ The plenum participants frequently turned to this latter thought. It was even proposed that a "Workers Academy" be created where talented young men and women from plants would be raised as production commanders.

The plenum examined the amalgam of problems which have formed over a long period. It approved the measures adopted by the CPSU Central Committee

Politburo and Secretariat to overcome the consequences of the violations of party principles and dangerous distortions allowed in the past. On the basis of the instructions of the 27th CPSU Congress it elaborated a new modern concept of cadres policy, linking it inextricably with the key avenues of the struggle for socioeconomic acceleration, setting the aim of seeking to ensure that every link in party, state, economic, and social work is headed by people devoted to the party and people, real innovators profoundly aware of the need for qualitative changes in our society.

The strategic course has been set. A lively, dynamic policy of bolshevik purposefulness has been shaped. It has been accepted undividedly by the people with all their hearts and souls. Now results are needed. Today, tomorrow, and always! And that requires the selfless offering of labor and creative exertion. We must act, act, and act again—vigorously, boldly, creatively, and competently!—M. S. Gorbachev stressed in his concluding speech at the plenum. That, if you like, is the main task of the moment. Everyone must apply it to himself.

/9599

CSO: 1800/302

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

PRAVDA REPORTS PARTY PURGE IN KRASNODAR

PM281531 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jan 87 Second Edition p 3

[Correspondent K. Aksenov article under the rubric "Party Life: Progress in Restructuring": "Who Is Averse to the Truth"]

[Text] Krasnodar Kray—SOVETSKAYA KUBAN recently published "Notes on Instances of Shielding of Violators of Party and State Discipline from Responsibility" and a CPSU Kraykom Bureau resolution. Almost a full page in the newspaper was taken up by a list of episodes involving "protection and patronage of leaders by senior officials, in contravention of the norms of the party statutes, the law, conscience, and honor."

And how did people in the kray react to this document, which, frankly speaking, caught many by surprise? After all, everyone here still remembers the times when people were selected to occupy high positions in line with the principle of personal loyalty or ability to please, and at times even as a reward.

The kray party organization has expended considerable energy over the last few years to plow deep furrows through the soil incubating the seeds of protectionism, family favoritism, and nepotism. But the roots of these weeds proved uncommonly tenacious. Even now attitudes toward the published facts proved ambiguous. In parallel with approval and support for the line of broadening the bounds of openness, you could also hear irritated voices and people asking in bewilderment: "What is the point of all this? Is it incumbent upon collectives to know about the sins of their bosses? Let the gorkoms and raykoms judge. If subordinates start to discuss and even to punish their leader, how will they obey and respect him afterward?..."

Actually this is a fairly widespread view. A sharp argument developed on this issue even at a kraykom bureau session. The point was that the draft resolution envisaged that all instances cited in the "Notes" should be submitted for discussion by the appropriate primary party organizations. And this meant that a number of high-ranking leaders of party and economic organs would have found themselves the targets of criticism "from below." Loike, for example, Yu. Polyakov and A. Yeruntsov, first secretaries of the Sochi and Armavir CPSU Gorkoms respectively; M. Lomach, general director of the "Kuban" Agroindustrial Combine; R. Aliberdov, first deputy chairman of the Adyge Oblispolkom; and others. There would seem to be nothing shameful about this:

After all, the law is the same for everyone in the party. But Kraykom Secretary B. Ponomarenko suddenly voiced objections.

The essence of his arguments was as follows: What is the point in raising questions about gorkom or raykom secretaries at primary organization meetings? A discussion at bureau sessions, for example, would be sufficient. This time, however, this approach was not supported.

"How are the statutes' demands to be perceived in such a case?" Kraykom Second Secretary I. Dyakov, who chaired the session, firmly objected. "Are they not the same for all Communists? Any misdemeanors by leaders ought to be known by the organizations to which they belong. Regardless of rank or office. Let everyone see: There will be neither concessions nor protection for anyone...."

It is worth noting that I. Dyakov, until quite recently first secretary of the Krasnodar Party Gorkom, was not upholding this principled position merely by chance. New and nontraditional forms of work with cadres were introduced in the city party organization on his initiative. Open selection, certification, and leaders' reports to collectives at party meetings and party committee sessions, encouraging truthful descriptions without any embellishment or gloss. All this helped to eradicate numerous chronic diseases in the kray center's work with cadres. People who have stained their reputations are no longer doing the rounds of nomenclature posts.

The experience accumulated by the Krasnodar Gorkom has now been approved in the kray and has been recommended for dissemination. There have been changes for the better in many party organizations. Some 35,000 comprehensive reports by Communists have been heard in only two years. Furthermore, about 500 persons occupying leadership posts have been negatively appraised.

Even so there are still officials who are averse to openness and scowl at restructuring. It somehow seems strange to them not to have zones where criticism is prohibited or to have to manage without their own people whom they "need." In the thrall of old methods, they still prefer promotions behind closed doors, disregard the collective's opinion, painfully and reluctantly part with all sorts of violators brought into the nomenclature at some time or another, and at times even defend them. This is frequently justified by references to production needs or to a leader being "irreplaceable." And even if it comes to removing those who have overstepped the mark from their posts, it is only "in connection with their transfer to other work," and this naturally creates indignation among people and engenders rumors, false interpretations, and a flood of complaints.

Here is one example. The Kray People's Control Committee removed Yu. Fomenko from his post as manager of the Glavsochispetstroy's No. 1 Trust. The grounds were: Defects allowed in building the No. 9 Housing Construction Cooperative apartment block in the city of Tuapse, bureaucracy, indifference, and a formalistic attitude toward complaints from cooperative members. Everything would seem to be evident. But the shoddy worker proved to have patrons. On the basis of an order from A. Shchepetilnikov, USSR minister of construction in southern areas of the USSR, Main Administration Chief V.

Pavlenko (who had on many occasions shielded his guilty subordinates from punishment) discharged Pomenko "at his own request" and immediately appointed him deputy manager of the very same trust.

"We have already studied the arsenal of patrons," I. Polozkov, first secretary of the CPSU kraykom, shared his thoughts. "We make no concessions for anyone. The publication of the 'Notes' is just one proof of this. I think that it made many people think twice. But when fighting—I would use no other word—for openness we also encountered other phenomena. Just imagine, people were even found in primary party organizations and collectives to defend leaders who were wallowing in abuses."

For example, bribe-takers had been active for a long time in the kray's "Selkhozkhimiya" Association. They demanded some kind of quid pro quo from kolkhozes and sovkhozes to supply them with additional mineral fertilizers and involved some leaders, previously respected in the kray, in their criminal network. All this was happening under the wing and, it can be said, with the complicity of Association Chairman E. Duitrenko. The adroit chief was even clever enough to send two of his sons to study at the agricultural institute as kilkhos scholarship holders. To put it briefly, no matter how you look at it, there is no place for such a person in the party ranks. Nonetheless, some people in the primary party organization defended him and initially even managed to shield him from strict punishment.

Recently the kray's party committee were forced to overrule hundreds of similar—to put it mildly—"liberal" decisions made by primary organizations. And the issue did not revolve around excessive leniency or softness. Once again patrons at times played an improper role. Communists had to solve questions of punishment with an acute shortage of publicity and lacking complete and truthful information. Even worse, instances of violations were often distorted, wrapped in "objective" reasons, and skillfully surrounded by catch phrases like "irreplaceable specialist" or "proper steward...." Even now such practice is no rare occurrence in places. Groups of like-minded toadies and spongers, at times totally unsqueamish about means, impose their will on collectives and try to shield the leading "benefactor."

This happens most frequently in smaller party organizations and the apparatus of various associations, administrations, and educational establishments. The wily "boss" makes a closed circle out of the personnel around him. He gives some of them a promotion or makes them a gift of a salary increment, others receive an apartment or a travel voucher to a sanatorium without having to wait their turn, yet others are spoiled with bonuses.... Bewitched by such "generosity," people form a wall around the leader, protecting him and preventing even the slightest remark against him. And should anyone dare to speak the truth, countermeasures follow immediately. They can be dismissed, laid off, even slandered.... And a solid cover is raised in advance against possible accusations: You can't do anything about it, they say, it is the collective's opinion.

Affirming openness, the party kraykom is now striving to talk with communists and working people bluntly, frankly, without covering up problems and its own

mistakes. All misdemeanors committed by communists, regardless of their official position, are discussed in primary organizations.

New forms of work by party, Soviet, and economic organs are emerging and are being polished. The "Monitoring Hour," for example, is very efficient, when regular kraykom bureau sessions examine progress in the fulfillment of previous decisions. A recent CPSU kraykom committee plenum heard for the first time a comprehensive report by Ye. Spiridonov, candidate member of the kraykom and chief to be Consumer Services Administration. The ensuing discussion was detailed, objective, and sharp.

Openness is particularly important in work with cadres. While making this demand of party organizations, the party kraykom backs it by its own example. Recommendations for appointment to the kraykom apparatus are now made openly, in the course of a broad discussion. This was how V. Voronko and N. Gritsenko were promoted to senior positions as kraykom section chiefs. Krasnodar's communists conducted an interesting discussion on I. Dyakov's candidacy for the position of second secretary of the CPSU kraykom. It seemed that there was nothing to be said: A well known person, authoritative, intolerant of falsifications, candidate of sciences, deputy to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, with a successful record as Gorkom First Secretary. But the conversation that ensued was sharp and principled. Many comrades also spoke about shortcomings in the communist's work and character. They spoke bluntly and honestly.

Many people in the Kuban have noted the restructuring in the party "shop." The phrase "This is the first time that..." is to be heard increasingly often. People are pleased with the renewal, the cleansing process. Even so, the fresh wind of changes has still not been felt everywhere. Evidence of this is provided by the thousands of letters received by PRAVDA and its correspondent's office in Krasnodar. Many complaints are also received by Kray organs. The writers describe with alarm abuses by some leaders, and cite instances of revenge for criticism, breaches of the law in the distribution of housing and material benefits, and excesses in the struggle against unearned incomes.

And this means that the Party Kraykom, all primary party organizations, and the Kuban's Communists must do much more strenuous work to finally and irreversibly establish everywhere an ideological and moral atmosphere in keeping with the demands of the time.

/12913

CSO: 1800/306

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

GEORGIAN CP CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS DISCUSSED

Officials Removed From CPSU Ranks

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 18 Nov 86 p 3

[GRUZINFORM dispatch under the rubric "In the Georgian CP Central Committee": "Called to Account for Falsification." First paragraph is source introduction.]

[Text] The Georgian CP Central Committee has discussed the question of instances of distortion and falsification of reporting data at the Kutaisi Silk Production Association of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Light Industry.

The resolution that it passed makes note that, as a result of a practice of forgivingness and tolerance which had taken root in the work of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Light Industry (former minister, G. P. Gantsemlidze and deputy minister, M. F. Teniyeshvili) and the creation of a situation whereby a lack of principle and general permissiveness prevailed in the activities of the Kutaisi City Party Committee (second secretary, D. D. Melkadze) and the Leninskiy Rayon Party Committee of the city of Kutaisi (first secretary, M. N. Pachuashvili), flagrant violations of socialist legality became possible at the Kutaisi Silk Production Association (former director, G. D. Goglichidze, director, O. V. Balanchivadze, and party committee secretary, N. K. Tugushi).

In accordance with the Georgian CP Central Committee resolution, for activities incompatible with his status as a member of the Communist Party and as a director, as demonstrated in the instances of accounts-falsification and their concealment, the director of the Kutaisi Silk Production Association, O. V. Balanchivadze, has been removed from the ranks of the CPSU and relieved of the position he occupied.

For his tolerant attitude toward instances of accounts-falsification, for creating conditions of inadequate control and permissiveness, for weakened discipline, for failing to ensure necessary public order within the system, which resulted in the instances of padding at the Kutaisi Silk Production Association, and for lack of sincerity, former Georgian SSR Minister of Light Industry G. P. Gantsemlidze has been removed from CPSU ranks.

For his unprincipled attitude toward the instances of accounts-falsification that were uncovered, for systematically dragging out the time spent on investigations and on examining the information which resulted from them, and for shortcomings in the assignment of personnel, the chief of the Control and Auditing Administration of the Georgian Ministry of Light Industry and member of the Communist Party, N.G. Bagaturiya has been removed from the party and relieved of the position he occupied.

For serious work deficiencies and lack of supervision, which led to flagrant violations at the Kutaisi Silk Production Association, the chief of the Economic Planning Administration of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Light Industry and CPSU member, M. A. Nadibaidze was issued a severe reprimand, to be entered in his party registration record. He has been relieved of the position he held.

For failing to take effective measures to establish the necessary moral and psychological climate at the Kutaisi Silk Production Association, for lack of principle and for insincerity, the first secretary of the Leninskiy Rayon Party Committee of the city of Kutaisi, M. N. Pachuashvili was issued a severe reprimand, which is to be included in his registration record.

Second secretary of the Kutaisi Gorkom of the Georgian CP D. D. Melkadze was given a severe reprimand, with an entry made into his party control card, for his lack of action in introducing strict state control, and in eliminating the causes for accounts-falsification and deviations in the Kutaisi silk production association, and for his liberalism.

Having taken account of the fact that M. F. Teniyeshvili was relieved of his duties as Georgian SSR Deputy Minister of Light Industry in December 1985, the Georgian CP Central Committee referred the question of his party responsibility to the Pervomayskiy Rayon Party Committee of Tbilisi city of for review.

The Kutaisi City Party Committee and the Leninskiy Rayon Party Committee of the city of Kutaisi were directed to examine the question of the responsibility of the Kutaisi Silk Production Association party committee secretary, N.K. Tugushi, and of other workers of appropriate party committees and of the production association, who permitted a lack of supervision and permissiveness with regard to instances of accounts-falsification and deception.

The question of the party responsibility of the former chiefs of the Department for the Silk Industry (L. I. Dolidze) and of the Administration of Bookkeeping and Reporting (A. D. Mikaberidze) and also of the senior inspector of the control and auditing administration (B. M. Kakachiya), has been referred for review to the primary party organization of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Light Industry apparatus.

The Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party issued a strong warning to Georgian SSR Minister of Light Industry and member of the CPSU, B. Z. Makashvili, having directed her attention to the serious shortcomings

which exist in the work of the collegium and apparatus in the struggle against negative phenomena. She has been directed to analyze the objectivity of statistical reporting submitted for enterprises and organizations and to establish the necessary state order in this regard.

Note was taken that the collegium of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Light Industry has examined the question of the accounts-falsification incidents at the Kutaisi Silk Production Association, with the result that the chiefs of the Department for the Silk Industry and of the Administration of Bookkeeping and Reporting (L. I. Dolidze and A. D. Mikaberidze), along with a number of the association's responsible workers, have been removed from their positions. The prosecutor general of the city of Kutaisi has instituted proceedings in connection with the incidents of padding at the Kutaisi Silk Production Association.

It was decided to forward information to the Moscow City party committee concerning the responsibility of CP member G. D. Goglichidze, who is on the party books of the Administration for the RSFSR of the USSR State Committee for Standards, in the incidents of accounts-falsification uncovered at the Kutaisi Silk Production Association.

It was indicated to oblast, city and rayon party committees that they need to establish appropriate controls to ensure strict public order at enterprises and in organizations, that they must increase the demands which are being placed on personnel, that they must not permit even a single incident of deviation from generally accepted norms and rules to pass without reaction to it, and that they must intensify their struggle against cases of padding and deception.

The departments of the Georgian CP Central Committee were directed to provide systematic assistance to the Kutaisi City Party Committee in reorganizing the working style and methods of party committees and primary party organizations, in improving their moral and psychological climate, and in strengthening them with honest, high-principled specialists having a highly developed sense of party duty.

Media Campaign on Production

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 24 Nov 86 p 3

[GRUZINFORM article: "Conference in the Georgian CP Central Committee." First paragraph is source introduction.]

[Text] A conference of the directors of republic mass information organs and of ideological institutions and departments has taken place in the Georgian CP Central Committee. Problems were discussed which were connected with the propaganda and explanation of the substance and purpose of introducing state inspection of output at industrial enterprises in light of the requirements set by the recent conference in the Party Central Committee and the address made there by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev.

The attention of conference participants was focussed on the necessity of making broad use of the pages of the republic's newspapers and journals and of television and radio broadcasts for explanatory work, based on concrete analysis of the course of this extremely important social and economic measure, of the readiness of labor collectives to reorganize their work under the conditions of the increased demands which are being placed on the quality of products being produced, and of problems and difficulties which arise on the local level.

The conference emphasized the importance of closely tying efforts to elucidate these problems to the pressing tasks of shifting industrial enterprises over to the new cost-accounting forms of production and economic activity on a broad-scale experimental basis, to the introduction of two- and three-shift work, to improvement in machine shift coefficients, and to other problems of intensifying the economy. It is now necessary to point the creative efforts of journalistic collectives in the direction of providing an ideological basis which will ensure unconditional fulfillment by the republic's labor collectives of the socialist obligations which they have undertaken, of delivery contracts, of planned goals for increasing labor productivity and for reducing production costs, for introducing new technology, and for timely completion of projects significant to society.

The conference developed a coordinated plan of measures for purposeful examination of these questions by the republic's mass information media.

13032

CSO: 1830/219

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

ESTONIAN CONSTRUCTION MINISTER CHARGED TO INCREASE TEMPO

Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian 4 Dec 86 p 1

[Excerpt] The Central Committee secretariat listened to a report by the Estonian SSR Minister of Construction L. Schmidt on his personal participation in the work to be done in increasing the capacity of construction organizations.

It was noted that L. Schmidt and the collegium and apparatus of the Estonian SSR Ministry of Construction are reorganizing their work style and methods, proceeding from the present demands of the party, still exceedingly slowly. The main attention is concentrated, as previously, on the solving of current tasks. New forms of construction production organization are being searched for and introduced poorly. Perceptible results have not been achieved in accelerating construction tempo and in increasing the capacity of construction organizations. The production potential of the economic branch increases only by 2-3% in a year. Attention toward the question of attaching workers' cadres, social development and the creating of stable labour collectives has weakened.

The CP of the Estonia Central Committee secretariat charged L. Schmidt, as the leader, with the duty of changing his work style and methods, to regard as the most important a greater exactingness towards the collegium members of the ministry and the apparatus of the ministry, the leading cadres of the construction organizations and enterprises, and the development of their initiative and independence is unconditional fulfillment of party and government instructions for an improvement of management and economic mechanism in capital construction.

/9716

CSO: 1815/20

PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

COURTS DIRECTED TO INCREASE PRESSURE ON ALCOHOL OFFENSES

Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian 28 Nov 86 p 1

[Text] The regular plenum of the Supreme Court of the Estonian SSR took place. On the strength of the report from K. Marks, member of the Supreme Court EoSSR, and the information from O. Antman, chairman of the People's Court of the Tartu rayon, and V. Lahtvee, chairman of the People's Court of the town of Parnu, the question of how the courts of the Estonian SSR observe the directive of the Supreme Court of the USSR, "The practice of application by courts of the legislation directed towards intensification of the struggle to be conducted against drunkenness and alcoholism," was examined.

The plenum directed the attention of our republic's courts towards the need of a further increase in the efficiency of the courts' activity, in the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism, and in speculation with alcoholic drinks and the distilling of raw spirits. Courts have to observe, without deviation, the demand of the law. The committing of a crime by a person in a drunken state is to be regarded as a circumstance which increases responsibility, and this has to be taken into account when passing a sentence to the offender. The attention of the courts was directed to the fact that securing publicity regarding court cases of the offences connected with breaches of legislation and dealing with the struggle against drinking and alcoholism is one of the most effective preventive measures.

The plenum was chaired by R. Simson, chairman of the Supreme Court EoSSR.

K. Kimmel, Procurator of the Estonian SSR; A. Kiris, minister of justice of the EoSSR and M. Tibar, minister of interior of the EoSSR took part in the plenum.

/9716

CSO: 1815/20

HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

IZVESTIYA SURVEYS LENIN'S WRITINGS ON ADMINISTRATION, MANAGERS

PM281749 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 3

[Georgiy Melikyan's article under the rubric "Analyzing Lenin's Writings":
"'Need... for Independent and Responsible Management'"]

[Text] These [headline] words are taken from item five of Vladimir Ilich's "Resolution on the work of the ZAMS (deputy chairmen of the Council of People's Commissars and the Council of Labor and Defense)." Here is that item in full. "5. Need for independent and responsible management from people's commissars and individual institutions within the limits of their rights and duties." Lenin's idea embraced three main interconnected and integral aspects of the proposed procedure: His deputies were to demand independence and responsibility from subsequent leaders and the latter, in turn, were to perform their functions efficiently. And so on throughout the system.

Time and again Vladimir Ilich returned to the draft of that resolution between 4 and 11 April 1922, thinking about it, deleting, finishing it off. Eight days full of the most diverse problems—the Genoa Conference, the condition of the state's depots, talks on concessions, the situation in the Donetsk industrial region, the struggle against the rapid growth of the central apparatus... What was the best way to resolve all these difficult questions?

Four years earlier, in 1918, immediately after the peace of Brest-Litovsk, Lenin said that the Bolsheviks had won Russia over, now they had to learn how to administer it. Now they had hard-won but such instructive experience. The civil war had died down and the mechanism of the New Economic Policy, which took tremendous effort to start, was now working irreversibly. The "Resolution on the Work of the ZAMS" was of special significance to Vladimir Ilich: It was the result of his reflections on the work of different levels of political leadership, as he used to say.

At that particular time problems of management worried Lenin more than the rest. The 11th Party Congress ended on 2 April. It had examined the lessons of the first year of the NEP. The results were encouraging but there was work ahead which was unprecedented in terms of its tasks and scale. That was when discipline was needed. "Long live labor discipline, zeal for work, and devotion to the workers and peasants cause!" said Lenin in a speech which he recorded on disk. Look carefully at how the question is phrased: devotion to the cause is verified by zeal in work.

...The scene changes to Petrograd. The Winter Palace had only recently been captured. A completely new life had begun. A worker visited Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya at the People's Commissariat of Education. They talked. How could people find time to visit us during the day? "There was a general meeting yesterday and we voted not to work today. Well, we are the bosses now."

This delusion had to be dispelled, it had to be made clear that since we are the bosses we are going to work better and harder and increase labor productivity. It was to that topic, in particular, that Lenin dedicated his first major post-October work, the "Next Tasks of Soviet Power."

Since then that thought had stayed with him. Let us consider: Vladimir Ilich's colossal pre-October activity—the creation of the party, the elaboration of the foundations of Bolshevism, the preparation of the revolution—was replaced for him overnight by the very difficult work of leading a brand-new state. How many new questions he faced! And the first question—in 1922, in the conditions of the new economic policy, perhaps the most important one—was the question of independent and responsible administration.

Back in April 1917 at a meeting of Bolsheviks taking part in the all-Russian conference of Soviets of workers and soldiers deputies, Lenin, who had just arrived in Petrograd, said that the art of administration could not be learned from books: "You try, you make mistakes, you learn how to administer." At the Ninth Congress in 1920 he stressed: "...Administrative ability does not fall from heaven, it is not brought by the Holy Ghost..." And no one will do anything for you, he wrote (see: "Left-wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder"). "You have to be able to think for yourself in order to understand each separate case." That is, you have to be independent.

And responsible. Lenin says that the collective discussion and solution of all questions must be accompanied by the establishment of the most precise responsibility of each person for the fulfillment of certain clearly and unambiguously defined tasks. On the evening of 17 October 1921 he addressed delegates to the second congress of political educational workers. The discussion centered on the propaganda of communism, the NEP, the elimination of illiteracy, and, of course, administration. "Discussion is a joint matter but responsibility is individual," was Lenin's formula. And he added bitterly: "We are suffering every step along the way from the inability to put this principle into practice."

He always took a personal interest in who was responsible for things. Look through volumes 50 to 54 of his works (they contain the letters and notes of Lenin as chairman of the Council of People's Commissars) and you will find dozens of demands for a clear reply to this concrete question. In a letter to N.A. Semashko, People's Commissar for Health, Vladimir Ilich, dissatisfied with the progress of "health week," as it was called, asked angrily: "...Who is responsible for this work? Is it just 'functionaries' with a grand Soviet title, who do not understand the general features, are not knowledgeable, who merely sign pieces of paper? Or are there /PROFESSIONAL/ [capitalized word between slantlines printed in italics] leaders? Who are they precisely?"

"Ensuring personal responsibility is the most important thing."

Lenin was aware of the vitality and tenacity of bureaucracy and red tape and brought all his anger to bear on them. He harbored no illusions. He knew that "we shall have to combat bureaucracy for many long years to come and anyone who thinks otherwise is a charlatan and a demagogue..." There are far too many conditions which reproduce this social ailment. It is important not to give way to them. The fight against bureaucracy needs hundreds of measures, a high standard of culture, and a readiness to begin from the beginning time and again.

We see red tape and bureaucracy exposed whenever Lenin speaks about the work of the administrative apparatus. It was in May 1921. He was outlining the theses of a speech at a trade union congress. Item 21 ended with the words: "...relentless struggle against slipshod work and bureaucracy." The next item, the 22d, was the final one: "Thus you will succeed." In the greeting to the Fifth all-Russian Congress of the trade union of Soviet workers, written one month before ill-health prevented him writing, Lenin cited the destruction of red tape and bureaucracy as the paramount immediate task of the present day "...and the most important task for the next few years..."

Vladimir Ilich believed the degree of effective and immediate performance of all the work taking place in each institution to be the true measure of its labor productivity. In this regard he proposed defining the norms of institutional work on the basis of systematic measurements of what Soviet workers can do in a given sector in a week and so on. He saw nothing here that was impossible (as some people argue today, too)...

Whatever Lenin dealt with, whatever he thought about, and whatever he studied, he always set examples of how to act in a given situation. For instance, he demanded the verification of performance. On many occasions he himself set an example here. He was troubled by the construction of the Kashirskaya power station. Work was held up. Vladimir Ilich pressed chief construction engineer G.D. Tsyrupa to buy equipment. He wrote to B.S. Stomonyakov, authorized representative of the People's Commissariat for foreign trade in Berlin: "The orders for the Kashirskaya power station are particularly important... I am making this your personal responsibility." Stomonyakov sent a reply by radio telegram in which he made observations and asked: "How long until the power station is commissioned?" B.A. Avanesov, deputy people's commissar of the Workers and Peasants Inspectorate, was told to "appoint a responsible worker, instruct him to urgently investigate the course and procedure of equipping the Kashirskaya construction project..." And later, when the station was generating electricity, Vladimir Ilich continued to take an interest in its work.

In the article "On Attributing Legislative Functions to the Gosplan" Lenin outlines the model leader of a state institution. He must be able as much as possible to draw people to him and must have a sufficient level of solid scientific and technical knowledge to be able to inspect their work. This is the main thing. On the other hand, it is also very important that the leader knows how to administer. This portrait contains characteristics of Vladimir Ilich himself. On one occasion he read in *EKONOMICHESKAYA ZHIZN* an article

entitled, "The Electrification of Russia" by N.N. Vashkov, chief of the electrification department of the Supreme Council of the National Economy [elektrootdel VSNKH]. After thanking the author, Lenin asked him for a number of additional reports. G.M. Krzhizhanovskiy, leader of the Gosplan and the State Commission for the Electrification of Russia, familiarized himself with the list of additional items interesting Vladimir Ilich and replied as follows: "Your letter to Comrade Baskhov made the same impression on us both: 'if only we had more readers like this!' As a technician... who has done all he can, I was only able to add a single point..."

Above all, a thorough knowledge of the work and the easy mastery of a subject were characteristic of Lenin's close associates. Dzerzhinskiy, chairman of the All-Russian Cheka, was simultaneously appointed People's Commissar for railways. Some people took this as "an appeal to the Cheka to establish order." But the People's Commissariat of railways required different forms and methods. Feliks Edmundovich, the romantic idealist [romantik] of the revolution, displayed a particular pragmatism: He acquired an excellent knowledge of technical terminology and delved into the details of railroad work. For example, he learned that a shunting engine was undergoing fuel-saving tests. He put everything else to one side—and spent two days with the engine crew... Two years later he was transferred to the chairmanship of the VSNKH. Again Dzerzhinskiy writes: "I must now learn..."

It goes without saying that Vladimir Ilich himself attached special importance to workers' competence. I.I. Radchenko, the old Iskrovets [revolutionary of the organization centered on Lenin's ISKRA], who organized the Glavtorf [Main Peat Committee] after the October Revolution, described how a session of the Council of People's Commissars discussed the question of the construction of huts for workers at the Shaturskoye deposit. Glavtorf estimated the cost of a hut at R4,000. There was another estimate—R2,000. Radchenko received the customary note from Lenin: "You once built some huts, are you sure that they cost R4,000?" After receiving an affirmative reply, Lenin wrote to the comrade who had disputed that figure. The latter replied: "No, I have not built any." When putting it to the vote, Vladimir Ilich formulated the question in these terms: "We have two proposals. The first is to give R4,000 per hut to a comrade who already /BUILT/ huts. The second is to give R2,000 per hut to a comrade who has /NOT/ [capitalized words between slantlines printed in italics] built huts." The first proposal was accepted.

Lenin, who never allowed himself to slacken, was equally demanding toward others. It did not matter whether the man in error was a close or long-standing acquaintance—he could expect strict censure. Lenin always told people the truth to their faces. A.I. Potyayev, chief of the Main Administration for Fishery [Glavryba], shirked a conflict which had erupted in his department. Vladimir Ilich reproached him: "You must use your rights, and not complain."

Learn how to administer Russia... As we can see, for Lenin this combined theory, practice, vast experience, powerful foresight, and that element which we now call the human factor. The years of the great restructuring of the young country's economy, the years of the new economic policy, were the culmination of his thoughts and at the same time his actions on this matter.

Explaining the point of that policy in the report to the 3rd Communist International Congress, VlaJimir Ilich said that responsible management of the country helps to win time, "...and winning time means winning everything."

Inhoc vinces. Thus we shall win.

/12913

CSO: 1800/300

HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

REVIEW OF SOVIET TV SERIES ON LENIN

PMO41600 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 24 January 1987 carries on page 5 a 2,400-word review by Aleksandr Svobodin under the heading "Coming Closer... Notes on Four Television Sketches About Lenin," reviewing the TV series on Lenin made for Soviet television in the sixties, but banned in 1969 and screened for the first time recently. Svobodin discusses past trends in the treatment of historical topics on TV and in movies, literature, and the theater and argues against the traditional "'conservative,' faceless History of the Revolution." He notes the staging in 1967 of a "memorable revolutionary history trilogy" at the "Sovremennik" Theater, a protest against that stereotype. At the same time, he says, "in television, producer Leonid Pchelkin was starting work on a series of short (about 50 minutes each) programs about Lenin," in the drama-documentary style. He points out that only 4 of the planned 10 programs were made, and that the then leadership of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting not only banned the programs, but "proposed to destroy them." The programs, Svobodin says, were saved thanks to the producer's determination, and have not been shown. He goes on to review the programs, emphasizing their realism in suggesting the difficulties faced by Lenin and portraying the force of his opponents' arguments. Lenin, he reports, is shown "talking with Bukharin, a strong theoretician, the party's favorite (he was called Bukharcik in party circles). Bukharin is embarrassed, rather depressed at having broken with Lenin, but holds his ground." Svobodin describes the "apogee" of the drama when Lenin's arguments turn out to be "more convincing"—"Lenin was not the best orator of the age, but he was the most convincing." Svobodin goes on to point out the novelty of this 1967 portrayal of Lenin by actor Mikhail Ulyanov, and expresses regret that Ulyanov "was unable to continue his work on the portrayal of the leader, after these programs," though he is coming back to the role now in a play by Shatrov now in rehearsal at the Vakhtangov Theater. Svobodin concludes by pointing out that though the innovative process was halted in 1969, "today the atmosphere of society's spiritual life is conducive to its continuation, to bringing the history of the revolution back to where it belongs. This requires bold decisions and statesmanlike approaches. We must continue to come closer to the truth!"

/12232

CSO: 1800/277

RELIGION

PRAVDA COMPLAINS OF FAILINGS IN ATHEIST EDUCATION

IN281651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 87 First Edition pp 2-3

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences A. Tursunov under the rubric "Questions of Theory": "Atheism and Culture"—capitalized words in slantlines printed in boldface]

[Text] Dushanbe--Successful restructuring is impossible without activation of the human factor seen as an organic unity of awareness and activity. It is only vigorous activity--inspired by high awareness--on the part of the masses that can be a creative force in the qualitative renewal of socialism. Marxist-Leninist convictions must become internalized, personally realized and suffered, and that means really firm convictions, which help us to live and work. Scientific atheism, which together with other sections of Marxist-Leninist theory forms the world view-ideological basis of communist education, must also make its own contribution to tackling this task. The criticism leveled at social sciences at the 27th CPSU Congress applies equally to scientific atheism. It should long ago have joined actively in the creative work that has begun to restructure the social sciences' system.

The fundamental principles of the new, atheist world view are laid down by the classics of Marxism. Atheism previously, based on the tenets of metaphysical materialism, was contemplative in nature. Being essentially a simple denial of God, it affirmed man's existence purely by means of this denial. But "atheism as a ///BARE/// negation of religion, constantly referring to religion, conceives of nothing on its own without religion, and for this reason is still itself a religion" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, Vol 36, p 161). Marxist atheism, based on the theoretical foundation of dialectical and historical materialism, produced a new, genuinely scientific view of the essence and origin of the religious form of consciousness. As an active, life-asserting principle it sets against the religion it denies the whole gamut of theoretically interpreted and philosophically generalized experience of scientific-cognitive and spiritual-practical mastery of the world.

At the present time a whole range of important problems are being elaborated within the framework of scientific atheism. At the same time the further development of scientific research and atheist propaganda activity requires us to overcome a number of important gaps in the theory and practice of atheism.

In particular, the revelation of the correlation between religion and culture is of topical scientific and ideological significance.

In tackling this question we must be guided by concrete historical analysis, which makes it possible to understand the manifest bankruptcy of both the apologetic exaggeration of religion's role in human history and the vulgar sociological concept of it as a kind of counterculture. Strictly speaking we should contrast not culture and religion as such, but the secular and religious bases of culture. This relation has changed from age to age and from region to region. Thus, in the Middle Ages the religious element was predominant in the cultures of both East and West. However, the historical unity of each of these cultures did not rule out a struggle between the secular and the religious—it was just as bitter as in previous centuries. As for their relative role in the development of culture as a whole, this can only be judged in a definite historical context.

It is impossible, for instance, to agree with Muslim ideologists who claim that Islam is a "civilizing religion." First, those who originally implanted Islam in Central Asia by fire and the sword did not hesitate to systematically and deliberately destroy the priceless monuments of culture and civilization of the peoples they conquered. Second, the fact that the peoples of Central Asia and also contemporary Afghanistan and Iran began to lag behind in their development from the 16th century on can be blamed historically in large part on Islam, which shrouded the whole region in a dense fog of superstition.

However, despite these indisputable historical facts, the theme of "Islam and culture" has long been systematically exploited by Muslim apologists. It is no accident that the jubilee events timed to coincide with the start of the 15th century of the Hegira were widely used for ideological publicity of "Islam's unprecedented cultural role" in history.

The most important concept of the Marxist philosophy of history in general and the philosophy of culture in particular is continuity. Like the mythical Antaeus, who gained a fresh burst of energy when he came into contact with mother-earth, every generation of people stands on its own feet, supported by the social and spiritual experience of previous generations.

The real scale and consequences of the cultural revolution that has taken place in the USSR are such that we will come back repeatedly to an interpretation of the essence, necessity, and social significance of that truly mass movement. In this connection a sharp rebuke is due to the surmises of Western Sovietologists who, in their treatment of the cultural revolution, put the main emphasis not on its creative force but on its defects, directly or indirectly attributing them to atheist principles allegedly imposed from above. This deliberately tenacious appraisal—both in its factual essence and in its ideological thrust—distorts the historical importance and significance of the party's cultural-transformational activity in the post-October period.

In the very first years of Soviet power, a whole range of practical measures aimed at preserving and assimilating the spiritual heritage of the past were implemented on V. I. Lenin's initiative. In 1918 alone the Soviet Government published more than decrees and resolutions on the protection of historical monuments and cultural assets. In the first 5 years of the new regime's existence the implementation of these important decisions resulted, in particular, in the restoration of more than 200 historical architectural monuments and many ancient icons and frescoes. Great attention was also paid to the cultural revival of outlying national regions.

And if we can talk about the errors of the past today, we can do so because we ourselves have grown up spiritually.

A graphic confirmation of increased social self-awareness is the establishment of the Soviet Cultural Foundation. The proposals by specialist scientists to create ethnographical parks (particularly in Moscow) and a data base of ethnographical data also merit attention.

Now, as we critically reappraise what has already been done, including what has been done in the sphere of humanitarian science, there is also a need for a more profound elaboration--free of considerations of current fashion--of traditional scientific problems, particularly the problems of "culture and religion." By the very fact that they flourish in conditions of a largely atheist society, the national cultures of the USSR's peoples refute the surmises of Christian, Muslim, and other ideologists about religion and culture as two products of the human spirit virtually united by a common blood supply. Now it is up to cultural historians and theoreticians: They must show, profoundly and specifically, when and how religion influenced the culture of this or that people and what conditioned its influence.

Replying to a question from a special correspondent of the CHICAGO TRIBUNE as to what he thought about "inflammatory speeches against religion" being attributed to the Communists, Marx said: "We know that forcible measures against religion are senseless; but it is our opinion that ///RELIGION WILL DISAPPEAR/// as socialism develops. Its disappearance should occur as a result of social development, in which education has a major role." Atheist education is an organic part of the purposeful ideological-educational work which the CPSU is consistently pursuing, seeking to shape in Soviet people a scientific world view and an active civic sense.

Sometimes the question arises: Why--when socialism is victorious--do we continue the struggle against religion as actively as before? Do we in fact need this struggle? After all, the main mass of believers today are involved in the new life and for the most part work for the good of the socialist motherland just as diligently as atheists and nonbelievers.

This question is perfectly natural. And it is connected to a considerable degree with the ineffectiveness of our atheist propaganda. It is no secret that some places in the country are experiencing a growth in religiosity among the population, and not only among people not permanently engaged in social

production but also among young people. The inflexibility of the old notion of a direct link between the degree of religiosity and the level of education has now become obvious. Because there are well-known cases of representatives of the intelligentsia (including teachers) becoming religious adherents, not to mention people with higher education (and even with specialist degrees!) becoming fascinated with all kinds of occult "sciences." At the same time, having declared religion to be a relic of the past, we cannot simply brush aside the obvious fact that an overwhelming majority of believers were born in the Soviet period and raised in an atheist environment.

These and other similar facts attest very cogently to the urgent need to **///RADICALLY RESTRUCTURE THE ATHEIST PROPAGANDA SYSTEM.///** Out of all the priority tasks and questions arising in connection with this restructuring and in need of prompt solutions in line with the contemporary demands made on ideological work, we will focus attention on just some key factors.

In reviewing the history of the development and spread of world religions, we cannot fail to ponder on how and by what ways and means they managed to seize the hearts and minds of many millions of people of so many dissimilar countries and continents. For these religions continue to conquer new spiritual territories. For example, Islam's adherents are increasing not only as a result of natural population growth, but also owing to the huge number of new converts (Islam is ceasing to be a purely oriental phenomenon). How does it manage to do this? Here we could point up many interconnected causes and conditions. We will point out just one, perhaps a very important one. That is Islam's ability for spiritual mimicry, its skill in adapting to local spiritual needs and aspirations and subsequently adapting those needs and aspirations to its own ends.

Is it not here, in particular, that we must seek the source of Islam's interweaving with local cultural traditions? However, it is not just some cultural traditions and national customs that have been Islamized; Islam has also penetrated deep into the structure of the way of life, filling literally every aspect of its adherents' daily life.

Hence the specific and often underestimated difficulties which stand in the way of overcoming religion. In order to be properly aware of them, it is necessary to know the object of criticism well. Fundamental scientific works on the history of religion are needed, as V. I. Lenin advised, with an overview of materials on the history of atheism and also of the link between religious organizations and the ruling classes (particularly the church and the bourgeoisie). Even on the basis of this kind of scientific research, carried out from positions of the principle of party-mindedness, it is possible to clearly separate the national from the religious, the secular from the ritual, and the popular from the church-based. This, in particular, facilitates the task of disseminating new Soviet rituals—as the new edition of the CPSU Program suggests.

Marxism established that religion is not the cause but the effect of "secular narrow-mindedness." That is why V. I. Lenin appealed for the struggle against

religion not to be limited to propaganda in ideological abstractions. He demanded that we coordinate this struggle closely with specific social practice, aiming for the most important thing—the elimination of the social roots of religion. In our society the social roots of religion have long been definitively undermined, but there still remain social conditions which may help (and do in fact help) to preserve it not only in the form of ceremonies and rituals which have become part of people's traditional way of life and consciousness but also at the level of world view-value principles. These conditions, however, are not always visible on the surface.

Let us take, for example, the problem of religiosity among women. At first sight the prime cause of the comparatively major influence of Islam on Central Asian women lies in their relatively small involvement in the process of social production. But there is a whole series of factors hidden behind this. Thus, mothers of large families make up a large percentage of those not involved in production. Yet the expansion of the network of kindergartens and creches still does not solve the problem, because another, far more acute problem remains. I am talking about the problem of infant mortality, which is still high in the Central Asian republics, especially in rural areas, where medical services lag behind considerably in both quantity and quality.

If we add to what has been said the fact that from the outset the so-called ultimate conditions of human existence (birth, death, and the tragedies of life) have been the objects of religion's particular attention, it is evident that the aforementioned factor plays an important role in the growth of women's religiosity. As V. I. Lenin observed, "...Gemmeth (sentiment—ed.), the ///PRACTICAL/// aspects, the search for something better, for protection, help, etc. are extremely important in religion" (Complete Collected Works, Vol 29, p 53). Evidently it is our underestimation of this which must also explain the cases of pensioners (former atheists!) who return to the bosom of religion. The source of this "new convert effect" may be not just internal reasons (spiritual crisis caused by individual, family, and other experiences and upheavals, but also external reasons (inflation of the social values toward which the individual was previously oriented).

The artistic literature of our time has already begun to deal with this. Very intensive philosophical-artistic speculation is under way about the scale and consequences of the social disease called lack of spirituality, which is very widespread and has been noticed for a long time. On a more general level it is a question of the moral state of Soviet society as it has moved into a fundamentally new stage of socioeconomic, political, and cultural development—a stage whose historical significance is comprehensively grounded within the concept of acceleration.

Hence the urgent need for an in-depth analysis of the relationship between atheism and morality. As shown by discussions of the question of the source of morality in its relation to religion, there is clear theoretical confusion in the understanding of this question, which is fundamental in the world view-value sense, and this confusion has its roots in the dilemma of classical atheism—long overcome by Marxism (what came first, morality or religion).

In this connection we cannot fail to note the well-known timidity of our philosophical science, not only in the prompt formulation of new problems but also in the interpretation of topical questions significant to the world view and already established in other spheres of the public consciousness. In any case Marxist sociology of culture still has not serious systematic research into the relative roles of religion and atheism in the social and spiritual development of mankind.

From the very beginning atheist criticism should have a dual nature: The debunking of religion and the values and ideals it preaches must be accompanied by the fashioning of atheist concepts in the believer and then the transformation of these concepts into firm convictions. A necessary precondition for tackling this task effectively is a sharp increase in the standard of culture of atheist propaganda. So far we have mainly concerned ourselves purely with the content of lectures and have often forgotten about their form. And it is not just a case of oratorical art and the ability to bring scientific-atheist arguments to the listener's awareness in an intelligible and vividly emotional way, nor just a case of possessing a sense of tact and respect for a person's individuality and convictions, and so forth. What is also very important in the form is the authority of the speaker, which determines so to speak the moral cost of his words; because he must not simply convince but also inspire, otherwise the desired ideological effect will not be achieved.

Here a lot depends on the activity of the "Znaniye" Society. The propaganda of scientific knowledge must be more closely coordinated with atheist propaganda, and major authorities in the sphere of science and culture--people who enjoy well-earned respect among the people--must be involved in this propaganda.

The need for a comprehensive approach to the resolution of tasks of communist education has now been fully realized. We can only count on success in this by closely coordinating all the elements of ideological-educational and propaganda work. Thus, atheist education will proceed more successfully, the more organically it is combined with other types and forms of education--labor, political, legal, moral, aesthetic, patriotic, and international education. Here I would like to draw attention to the intrinsic link between atheist and international education. As evidence by the experience of socialist building in traditional Islamic areas, adherence to the Muslim religion is frequently associated in believers' minds with their membership of a given ethnocultural community. Hence the interdependence of religiosity, national organization, and national egoism. Now we must consider two new factors--an internal factor (the objective growth of foreign elements in a previously compact national milieu) and an external factor (the attempt by clerical anticommunism and anti-Sovietism to utilize this fact to kindle international differences and revive nationalist prejudices, and attempts by bourgeois nationalism to sometimes dress in religious attire). The party warns against artificial urging and against checking mature objective trends in the development of national relations.

A high standard of international contacts must be fostered from the very earliest age. It is the general education school which must become the focus of ideological-educational work, including international and atheist education. The role and authority of the teacher as spiritual mentor must be sharply increased.

The resolution of the topical and important ideological tasks set by the 27th CPSU Congress requires a decisive switch by the whole front of social sciences to confront practice. As regards the problems of atheist education, they relate to the need to consistently implement a profoundly considered system of measures calculated for a long period. It is impossible to fulfill this work at a serious scientific and ideological level without the comprehensive development of the theoretical bases of atheist education.

/9599

CSO: 1800/303

RELIGION

RSPSR PAPER CARRIES FEATURE ON ATHEISM

PM291359 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 January 1987 First Edition devotes the whole of page 4 to a feature comprising a 3,500-word abbreviated version of an I. Dyakov article entitled "Father Nikolay's Earthly Concerns," to be published in the magazine YUNOST, a list of recommended books on antireligious topics, and a 1,500-word abbreviated reprint of a NEWSDAY article entitled "Where Do Little Green Men Live?" on the search for intelligent extraterrestrial life.

The Dyakov article is an account of a conversation with one "Father Nikolay" (not his real name), a 27-year-old priest of the Russian Orthodox Church and graduate of the Odessa Seminary. The author states that he was prompted to write the article by "the present attempts of the church to 'ennoble' its doctrine and history, to shift certain emphases, and to rid itself of features in all aspects of its activity that are archaic or discredit the church." He says that Father Nikolay is "one of those young priests who, because of their character and 'out of official duty,' are ready to participate in the modernization of the church."

Speaking of the reasons that prompt young people to turn to religion, Dyakov says that they could be "tiredness and a loss of faith in oneself; broken by personal unhappiness, an undereducated person can come and does come to the church," which "provides an illusion of comfort, an illusion of an end to searching, an illusion of truth." Father Nikolay counters this argument by claiming that "in our age of stress and the scientific and technical revolution the moral state of the world can find harmony only in religiosity, that only in this will disturbed and confused hearts find the solution to all their troubles and doubts, and that it is necessary to humble oneself before God and attain the secret of spiritual life in the struggle against sin." But Dyakov retorts: "The believer accepts any assertion, no matter that it runs counter to reason and to himself. He consents to everything and resists nothing. Faith proclaimed as salvation accustoms you not to trust yourself and so it frequently destroys."

Dyakov disputes Father Nikolay's argument that "loss of religious feeling inevitably leads to a lowering of morals" by saying: "This means that people will commit crimes as soon as they lose the hope of reward and are rid of the fear of punishment. But do fear and the hope of reward really help to prevent evil? There seems to be no room for conscience proper. He who avoids

committing bad deeds only because he considers them dishonorable is far more moral than he who renounces bad deeds merely out of fear of punishment beyond the grave. It essentially turns out that it is atheism and not religion that strengthens morality.

"Incidentally, to us, who are unfortunately accustomed to bureaucratized atheism, which is dry and pedantic and timidly avoids publicity of the majority of 'theological' questions, it seems 'without doubt' to have conquered. However, closer to what is wanted is the picture of atheism in the better, lofty, soul-liberating sense as an island in the world ocean of tenacious, imperious, aggressive prejudices. This picture is very useful: It mobilizes reason and makes it more effective in the struggle against them."

Taking up this theme again later on, Dyakov writes: "Propaganda of atheism must be proud, confident, and liberating. But how afraid we are that just one mention of God and religion might arouse in children an interest in the church and in faith! We are so afraid that we are sometimes prepared to accept everything, provided that it does not resemble faith in God. Total silence coupled with the speculativeness, abstractness, and didacticism of atheist propaganda has the opposite effect." And he concludes his article by emphasizing that "only by indefatigable work and concern not only for oneself but also for the public good does a person justify his purpose in the world."

/9599

CSO: 1800/303

RELIGION

COMMENTATOR EXAMINES 'DANGER' OF RELIGIOUS SECTS

OW260205 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0430 GMT 23 Jan 87

[From the Novosti newscast; Vladimir Molchanov commentary: "Departure From Reason"]

[Text] Some rogue named Mirza who lived in Karakalpakhiya proclaimed to the world that he was a man of God or a wise man with the gift of extrasensory perception. He robbed the credulous and ruined the destinies of people; he eventually committed murder and was severely punished. We know from our press that belief in the supernatural and various miracles is unfortunately very tenacious sometimes. The leaders of various anti-Soviet centers in the West have been trying to use this belief in the supernatural for infiltrating our country. Let us take for instance the sect created by a Korean now living in the United States. By preaching that a new Christ, meaning himself, will soon come to our world for a second time, Mun has made a fortune of \$75 million. Prosperity and the goodwill of the authorities in the United States are on Mun's side for one reason: he hates communism. Mun has also tried to spread his ideas in the Soviet Union, and of course not without the aid of the CIA, with which he has been collaborating for many years; according to the testimony of the French newspaper LIBERATION.

Some time ago, Pamela Carnier, the governess of a U.S. diplomat, was detained in the old Russian city of Kalinin where she tried without success to form a Mun-followers sect. And there is another man of God, Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh, who has nothing against getting supporters of his ideas in our country. In an interview with the West German DER SPIEGEL he admitted that he loves Hitler and considers him to be a saint. A multimillionaire expelled from the United States for committing criminal offenses, he is now somewhere in Nepal. Here are some of Rajneesh's main ideas: Help capitalism regain lost position and oust socialism, reject logic, one's identity and conscience, and fully submit to the will of Prophet Rajneesh.

People carried away by the ideas of Mun, Rajneesh, and other wise men and prophets are far from being harmless to society. Remember the tragedy in Guyana where about 1,000 deceived sect members committed suicide. These are the shocking extremes people go to when fooled by men of God. So there is no need to exaggerate or underestimate the danger of the mysticism fad. And we must not forget that it is no accident that they are trying to introduce this fad to us.

/9599

CSO: 1800/303

RELIGION

BRIEFS

UZBEKS EXPELLED FOR RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES--Tashkent, 24 January--A notice board had been installed in public view at the Uzbek Ministry of Communications' Republican Special Communications Center on instructions from S. Tairov, chief of the center and member of the CPSU. Staff members, including Communists, used it regularly to post announcements inviting their colleagues to various religious events. On one occasion, for example, there was a notice that senior controller S. Tursunov (a young Communist and secretary of the Komsomol organization) was holding a religious memorial service with prayer reading at the home of his later father-in-law. The Tashkent Party Gorkom Bureau has expelled Tairov and Tursunov from the CPSU ranks. [TASS report: "Expelled from the Party"] [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jan 87 First Edition p 3 PM] /12913

CSO: 1800/315

TV STUDIO CANCELS SECOND SHOWING OF CONTROVERSIAL FILM

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 4 Feb 1-8, 87 pp 8-9

[Text]

"Moscow News" seems to have been the first paper to review the film "Arkhangelsk Muzhik" by Anatoly Strelyany and Marina Goldovskaya. Therefore, many readers have been asking us the puzzling question: why the promised repeat of this film has not yet been shown on Central Television. Below is the author's appraisal of that review, Lev Voskresensky.

First of all, I would like to apologize to those whom I have unwittingly misled. Ever since the first days of the New Year I kind of shouted from house-tops, so to speak: on Saturday, January 10, put aside all your cares and spend an hour at your TV set, there will be a repeat showing of Anatoly Strelyany and Marina Goldovskaya's documentary film "Arkhangelsk Muzhik". The film is about a hard-working peasant and what hinders him from living a normal life and performing his work well, about solving the country's food problems more quickly and, generally speaking, about making human life more dignified.

There were so many comments and disputes about "Arkhangelsk Muzhik" that it became a phenomenon in social life. After the premiere letters started appearing at editorial offices. For instance, we read in the *Govorit i Pokazyvayet Moskva* weekly (No. 2, January 1987) of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting: "Everyone in our area is talking about how a documentary film was shown recently - very interesting, instructive and useful for farmers. But we, inhabitants of the Beshevsky state farm (Donetsk Region), did not see it. We ask you to repeat it." And the Central TV Studio announced: "We shall show it once again."

People believe the written word. They expect. At the appointed hour they switch on the TV. But what is it? Not quite what we expected! There is figure skating on the screen.

No, we are by no means against this wonderful sport and, at a different time, would only rejoice at poutines on ice. But when triple jumps start on parquet and on office carpets, when spins, supports and somersaults are executed near reception rooms and superiors' telephones and buttons, and end result is the removal of a film that is scheduled to be shown - there is nothing to be happy about.

On January 10, at 1 p.m., millions of people, gathered in front of their TV screens, saw a graphic and sad example of how words do not square with deeds. Did they promise? They did. Did they advertise? They did. Did they honour their promise? No. Did they explain the reason? Did they at least apologize? No. Again it was silence, as if nothing happened and should not have happened: "Here are dances on ice for you, admire and keep silent."

What is it: is this going to be the case in the future?

No, comrades, it is not going to be the case any longer. The times are different. We are no longer what we used to be. Grains of hope for genuine openness are beginning to sprout, and the greater the number of people who believe in this, the better - the sooner we will outgrow the habit of keeping silent.

Of course, not everything is simple. But there is a reasonable way out. Suppose there are some who look askance at Arkhangelsk muzhik Nikolai Sivkov. Or those who take exception to the family contract. Suppose there are some who deem it necessary to end reminiscences about NEP or the 20th CPSU Congress and, in the final analysis, to put an end to the new approach to the solution of economic problems. There are some who, speaking aloud about the reconstruction, are covertly convinced that there is nothing

more dangerous than really radical reforms. Are there really such people? There always will be. But let such people stand up in front of the people, give their names and state their doubts and apprehensions directly and openly - not in memos, not behind the scenes, but via the press, via the same television. And we will calmly, without agiotage, as it befits real muzhiks - painstakingly and through debate - argue and compare points of view, looking for the grains of truth that is so necessary for all of us. To make a long story short: let's boldly get it all out in the open! The viewer, the reader, the listener or, in plainer terms, the people will decide who is right and who is not.

And our discussion on the "Arkhangelsk Muzhik" is not over. We'll return to this theme. And see the film After the figure skating ends.

/9317

CSO: 1812/46

LITERARY CRITICS CALL FOR 'GENUINE FREE SPEECH'

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 4 Feb 1-8, 87 p 3

[Article by Igor Dedkov]

[Text]

Some 140 years ago Hertzén, speaking of the greatest assets of man, put "human dignity" and "free speech" above all else. And Hertzén gave his entire life to protect these eternal values in their broadest social sense.

As we know, free speech itself is never given to anyone. Let us recall Radichéev, or Lenin. Let us recall all those who were included in the long historical process between them. We witness a grim struggle, persistent work on spiritual liberation, and we see how much has been won and bequeathed, not to someone else, but to us. The new thinking, based on reality and not on fiction - on the interests of the toiling people - had already started. Let us try to imagine that the essence of revolutionary, democratic thought and action has been removed from the historical pattern of life in Russia to suit some new zealots of sovereign spirit. Would not the picture that would unfold before us stun us with its lack of colour, with its fatal and submissive monotony, and would it not be offensive for national memory and honour?

I am writing this, thinking, above all, about literary affairs, about literary criticism, but I do not propose at all to declare that free speech is allegedly absent or that there is not enough dignity. Free speech can be heard and there is enough dignity, we can see testimony of that in the pages of our press today. But still, free speech is so hard to master. As soon as one grows out of the habit of using it, it begins to jar our hearing and cause apprehensions. Because the more there used to be undesired subjects for literature and journalism, the more there were authors declared untouchable regarding criticism, the more apprehensions we encounter now, after the bans and privileges (which had not been legalized at any time) have been lifted. The apprehensions vary in their nature: some people are naturally afraid of everything, others hold dead idols dearer than living humanity, and still others are simply suspicious of any negation. Leo Tolstoy wrote, as if thinking of such apprehensive people: "You discover outrages, so do I. But you discover that people are rejecting the outrage, and I - in that the outrage exists." We subscribe to this.

It is not at all obligatory that free speech be a denunciation, a rejection of something or an attempt at making public something unseemly. It may well be that the dearest and most reliable versions of free speech are when the entire movement of thought embraces the fullness of living life and, thinking it over, a person's living impact, honesty and undauntedness in dealing with the facts of reality and of literature, and the precision and vividness of generalization.

The attempts made by some of our papers to confront the well-balanced reports from round-table discussions with critics of the free, "monologue-type" forms of literary criticism (which allegedly fails to cope with its tasks) seem to be strange and holding no promise. The recent critical monologues by Anatoly Strelyany on Valentin Ovechkin's lectures, in *Novy Mir*, and by Natchya Ivanova and Igor Zolotarevsky on the prose works published last year in magazines, in *Znamya* - offer not only vivid proof of the convincing and forceful nature of traditional forms of literary criticism, but signify also the more consistent use in literary criticism of direct and free speech, and of central ideological and aesthetic ideas. It would not be offensive for even the best of our literary critics to agree with Strelyany's precise words about our criticism: "Life never echoes the writer's concessions." And literary life echoes the concessions made by literary criticism only with more indulgence of bad taste, untruth and falseness.

Genuine free speech is never free of responsibility and shame. And this is not its weakness or narrowness, but its courage and dignity. This is the way in which it differs from the "free speech" of garbage heaps, of informing against people, of threatening anonymous letters and of base concoctions.

It is hard for literary criticism and journalism to master free and direct speech. Quite often one has to battle for the right to it. Apparently, it is necessary to learn free speech (which means also human dignity) in the same way as it is necessary to learn everyday democracy, which is a foundation and a norm.

/9317

CSO: 1812/46

CULTURE

WRITERS UNION CONDEMNS OFFICIAL NEGLECT OF KAZAKH PAST

Alma-Ata QAZAQ ADEBIYETI in Kazakh 21 November 86 p 11

[Text] The role played by the historical and cultural monuments of the peoples of the USSR in forming the communist worldview and activist position in daily life of the individual, in providing patriotic and internationalist education to the younger generation and in their multi-faceted spiritual development is extremely great. (It is well known that this question was discussed in detail at the Conference to Establish a Soviet Cultural Fund recently held in Moscow.) Such historical materials of past ages illustrate the material and cultural lives of past generations, the histories of the people's masses over many centuries and the formation and development of the multi-ethnic Soviet state and are factors preventing the loss of continuity of tradition. For this reason the great concern and great regard of later generations for all the various things esteemed and respected by the people is necessary. Such a high goal is worthy of a creative society believing completely in the historical importance of the acts that it is carrying out, and of a truly humanistic society which appreciates honest work and high quality work.

The Soviet government has continued to show every possible concern for the cultural monuments connected with the history and fate of our peoples from the very first days of its existence. A leaflet was distributed in the very first days after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution stating: "Citizens! Your former masters have been overthrown. They have left behind enormous riches. They are a heritage witnessing the spiritual powers of our and your ancestors. Do not destroy any of the precious heritage. Protect the monuments, the palaces, the artifacts and documents. All of this is something for you to be proud of." One of the very first documents of the Soviet government signed by V.I. Lenin was directed at the protection of the historical and cultural monuments of our nation.

At present, the Leninist principle calling for protection of the people's heritage, the spiritual riches of the nationalities, has become a basic branch of our law. There is absolutely clear formulation in this regard in the USSR Constitution. More recently, greater significance has been assigned to the question than before. Ratification of the 1976 USSR and 1978 KaSSR Laws "On Protection and Use of Historical and Cultural Monuments" were noteworthy events along these lines and have become effective measures.

There was also discussion about our people's spiritual heritage at the 27th CPSU Congress. It was stated in congress materials that "The party, highly valuing the broad social initiative towards national history and towards the riches of our multi-national culture of many centuries, has supported the development of patriotic feelings felt by us all."

Protection of our spiritual heritage and historical monuments and their promotion is something carried out by the state in the Soviet Union and is the honored duty of every USSR citizen. In this connection, there are many historical monuments of which we can be proud in Soviet Kazakhstan, which is a bright monument [itself] to the Leninist nationalities policy.

Our people, bearing in mind the need to protect our rich heritage of many centuries and to investigate, evaluate and select from it in a scientific sense, founded the KaSSR Society for the Protection of Historical Monuments in 1972. The society performs various activities in the republic in discovering and cataloguing historical, cultural and artistic monuments and in informing [the public] about their importance and role.

However, be this as it may, there are still deficiencies in this important work. In particular, we cannot say that we have been carrying out properly the work of instilling remembrance of this heritage, which have left behind immortal traces in the history and cultures of our people, and of using the styles and arts of this heritage broadly in the communist education of the younger generation. To be sure, it is also true that when we think of the care that has been shown in recent years for the precious heritages of our history and culture and of the active endeavor in this area, there have been good accomplishments and achievements in regard to our cultural heritage. Moreover, it is also true that no one can take these good accomplishments and achievements from us. For this reason, we think it suitable to share [with others] [our views on] those things which we have still not been able to accomplish in this area or which we think unsatisfactory or less than adequate.

We live in a socialist society created by honest work. What is called the Soviet People is a new type of nation in history. We take pride in the solidarity of many generations which have brought into being a new feeling suitable to this environment, to this society. In the strictest sense, the Kazakh people have been able to be certain of its historical existence as a nation only during the years of the Soviet government. But this good fortune was not something achieved easily, without struggle. We must remember with continued great interest the elder generation which has passed through the great school of the Leninist party, growing up on the road of citizenship, tempered in the fires of the revolution, the famous party and soviet leaders of our first socialist republic. Unfortunately, today's generation knows nothing of what has become today of these famous figures who sweated for the people, i.e. the famous party and soviet leaders of the republic. Thus the time has come, taking our example from the exemplary merits of the great Russian people, which has great respect for the historical past of the people, and from other fraternal peoples, to designate in Alma-Ata also a popular pantheon such as is found in cities such as Moscow, Leningrad and Tbilisi. What we propose is that the plateau extending from the upper side of Kotobe should be such a pantheon. Would this not be an expression of the education of today's and future generations in the high revolutionary

spirit of the older generation? In this connection we must pay attention to many wonderful exemplary actions of fraternal Russian, Khirghiz, Armenian and Georgian peoples and peoples of the Baltic littoral.

Someone must think about the present state of the tomb of the great poet, philosopher and thinker of our people, Abay, at Zhidebay. The external appearance of the tomb of the great poet, enclosed by concrete, surrounded by square slabs with a chain on top is very shabby. The tombs built by Abay himself at the graves of his mother and relatives are ready to fall down.

Zhidebay—this is an honored region, a sacred memorial which was the source and origin of Abay's songs, of Abay's thoughts. Why are we now waiting to make this honored residence into a sacred park?

In May of 1984 the 90th anniversary of Bayimbet Maylin was celebrated in Kustanay City. Esteemed guests were invited and elevated words pronounced. It was repeatedly called to mind how B. Maylin was one of the founders of Kazakh literature and one of its classical writers. But today, however, there is not the slightest monument at the place where the gifted writers was born. Moreover, the house where Beyimbet was born is now about to be pulled down.

At present the house where Iliyas Zhansugirov was born still exists in Kzyl-Orda. However, due to lack of upkeep and repair, it is near to collapse. There are no traces whatever now of places where were born or lived Sakin Sayfullin and other distinguished cultural personalities, poets, writers and actors in the city. All has been destroyed and has gone to ruin.

The Qozha Akhmet Yassawi Mausoleum has undergone complex repair. This is indeed true. However, all the old graves surrounding the mausoleum have already gone completely to ruin due to long-term exposure to local bumping and vibrations. We are deprived of the tombs of famous figures who have left behind considerable traces in the history of our people among the [graves gone to ruin]. Why have we not now thought of raising an obelisk dedicated to them.

Likewise, it is known to us all that the famous dome of the Qozha Akhmet Yassawi Mausoleum complex was taken temporarily to Leningrad to be shown to guests at a 1939 international conference. The span of that "temporary" removal has now lasted half a century. In that time there has been limited restoration of the Yassawi complex, an adequate museum has been opened inside and it has become an historical site astonishing guests from far and near. All this is very fine, except that the domed section looks empty and lonely without its dome. The time has come to remember the need to replace the detached historical dome in its own place, making the domeless cavity of the complex complete.

However, it is difficult to say that the KaSSR Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments and the KaSSR Ministry of Culture alone will be able to improve and renew and completely restore these heritages which have born witness to our historical past. This is because it will require the direct assistance and aid of republic party and soviet organizations, cultural and social offices, and likewise local party, soviet, union and Komsomol organizations. Only if this is the case in abundance will we be able to undertake the

needed and specific measures, when we have made known and actively recognized ancient monuments to prevent their vanishing from our glances and being forgotten.

From this point of view, it is an obscenity that we have still established no monuments to most of our figures founding the Kazakh fine arts in this our era of prosperity.

There are today, to be sure, numerous monuments of the famous great founders, the undying originators of the Kazakh musical culture, which has proudly come forth onto the stages of the world; creators such as Qorqyt, Qurmanghazy, Bayzhigit Yqylas, Qyzdarbek, Ashintay, Dawletkerey, Bala Maysan, Sqyr Yeszhan, Seri, Zhayau Musa, Ukili Ybyray, Mukhit, Balwan Sholaq, Yestay, Madi, Ghaziz, Zharylghapberdi, Mayra, Wayis, Mukhamedzhan, Berikbol-Agashayaq, Dina, Kenen and Sugir. At present the lives of this group of giants are being investigated in detail and we are carefully promoting their monuments. I can say that we rejoice at this and are proud. However, should not the high quality citizens of a culturally advanced country not only be thoroughly familiar with the spiritual treasures of their people's arts personalities, but also be respecters of their spirits as well. In this connection, can we say no more than the monuments at the tombs of Qorqyt and Kenen?

Likewise, the tomb of Qurmanghazy appears very insignificant to the eye. Somehow simple cement walls have been provided for the tomb of Birzhan. There is neither marker nor ornament on the grave of Aqan Seri. The tomb of Zhayau Musa is bare soil; but the grave of Mukhit has fallen down and the wind has blown the soil away. The tomb of Zharylghapberdi is ready to fall down. The tomb of Tattimbet is collapsing from people walking nearby. The tomb of Sugir on the territory of "Sozaq" Sovkhoz is in a like state. The tomb of Yestay remains unlooked after, unprotected.

The same sort of situation also applies to the monuments raised at the graves of our famous poets and heroes. Only a short while ago we celebrated the 250th Anniversary of the Submission of the Kazakhstan to Russia. The tomb of Abilkhayr Khan, the instigator of this submission so important for the historical fate of our people, which is located along the Qabyrgha River, is still in a dilapidated state. In our view, if we suddenly remember and raise a beautiful monument, it should not be an honor for long vanished Abilkhayr Khan but as a powerful honor for the friendship of two peoples today which has become an historical reality.

The examples of the heroism and honor of Isatay and Makhambet, who came forward against the yoke of the khans as the national liberation movement of the common people began at the beginning of the 19th century, are ingrained in the hearts of the people. But there are no dedications or monuments devoted to them. Only rocks piled up on the moss covered grave mound at the tomb of the bard Bagan at the foot of the Dalba mountains (Karaganda Oblast, Ul'-yanovskiy Rayon).

Leaving the odier monuments aside, it is well known to the public what state the tombs of Sultanmakhmut Torayghyrov and Meshhur Zhusip Kopeyev, born at the

beginning of this century, are in. Likewise, each of the historical sites connected with the lives and creativity of many fine individuals such as A. Zatayevich, Ye. Brusilovskiy, V. Ivanov, P. Vasil'yev, P. Kuznetsov, M. Batalov, K. Altayskiy, N. Anov, Bilal Nazym, I. Satarov, L. Khamidi, A. Qashawbayev and I. Bayzaqov, who make contributions to the growth and flourishing of Kazakhstan's multi-ethnic culture, should not remain outside of popular concern. We consider it a good thing that the appropriate organs must show appropriate consideration and attention to all of these things.

In writing this letter, we think it our duty to draw attention to the fact that the time has come to take systematic measures as republic, oblast, rayon party, soviet, union and Komsomol organizations, organizations to protect historical and cultural monuments, labor collectives, students and the general public participate together in this important work of great benefit to the people.

In the name of the senior writers of the Kazakhstan Writers Union:

Alzhappar Abishev, Dikhan Abilev, Qalizhan Bekkhozhin, Khamit Erghaliyev, Maksin Zverev, Muqametzhan Qaratayev, Syhrbay Mawlenov, Ziya Samadi, Abu Sarsenbayev, Dmitriy Snegin and Adi Shapipov.

/12232

CSO: 1832/409

CULTURE

AYTMATOV ADDRESSES ALL-UNION ONOMASTICS CONFERENCE

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad SOVET TURKMENISTANY in Turkmen 30 October 1986 carries on page 2 a 1000 word article by S. Atanyyazov, director of the terminology sector of the Magtyaguly Institute of Language and Literature of the TSSR Academy of Sciences, and B. Veyisov, head of the Turkmen language faculty at the A.M. Gor'kiy Turkmen State University, on the 1st All-Union Conference on the Onomastics of the Turkic Peoples. The conference, which was attended by more than 150 Soviet scholars, was held in Frunze. Reports were read on personal names, toponymy, ethnonymy, titles, tribal names, names of animals and stars. In his address Chingiz Aytmatov stressed "the great importance of historical toponyms as sacred symbols of the past in the patriotic education of the younger generation."

NATIONAL THEATER NEGLECTS REVOLUTION, WORKERS

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad SOVET TURKMENISTANY in Turkmen 26 October 1986 carries on page 4 a 400 word Turkmeninform report on a plenum of the administration of the Turkmenistan Theater Society to discuss improving the work of republic theater and concert organizations. "Many of the themes of plays staged by republic theaters are minor and professionally weak. Historical and revolutionary themes and the life of the working class and students continue to be neglected by national playwrights. This significantly lowers the art's educational influence on audiences. The ideational-artistic level of oblast theater spectacles is not high enough." It is added that "problems in creating proper living conditions for actors and creative workers are still especially severe" at oblast theaters.

/12232

CSO: 1835/405

CULTURE

ESTONIA OPENS FIRST VIDEO STORE

[Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA on 27 December 1986 announces on page 1 the opening in Tallinn of Estonia's first video store. According to the article, Video cassettes from a catalog which lists more than 300 local and foreign films and musical programs are available to customers for a week's rent. The advertisement distributed announcing the new store claims that new Soviet films will be available for distribution in the Tallinn video shop 2 to 3 months before they are put out for general distribution. A video salon for 15-20 viewers is also planned for this location, as well as small rooms for a maximum of 4 viewers to view movie programs selected from the inventory.

/12232

CSO: 1800/287

SOCIAL ISSUES

MOSCOW NEWS ARTICLE ON RESTRUCTURING

PM051251 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No 5, 1 Feb 87 p 11

[Article by Aleksandr Levikov: "Leningrad Notes; The Spirit of Restructuring is Reflected in the Atmosphere of Disputes. People Are Talking About What They Used to Keep Quiet About"]

[Text] Sociologists are wrong not to study notes from the auditorium. Guardedness or directness, primitiveness or an unorthodox approach—everything, everything contained in the arrows directed at the speaker (including their number) in my view characterizes not only a specific speaker and given audience but also the state of public consciousness. Feelings, expectations, and hopes. The degree of trust in the words uttered and in the level of legality in the state.

The frankness of notes is prompted by the sincerity of the speaker, but to an even greater degree by the shift toward truth throughout Soviet society. When the top leaders of the ruling party and state repeat again and again that complete truth is needed and that half-truth is worse than lies; when journals publish stories and novels which not so long ago used to terrify editors; when a purge is taking place before everyone's eyes, and the press is not only "babbling about restructuring" but is seeking its reality in struggle, without fearing to name both individual names and whole social groups of "resistance fighters"—when all this is happening, the climate of audiences also changes.

I want to familiarize MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI readers with a few notes from the auditorium and I shall reproduce briefly my answers to them.

I was asked to speak at the V. V. Mayakovskiy writers' center in Leningrad at one of their "writers' Thursdays" which bring together not only a literary audience but also scientists, specialists of various kinds, peoples of all ages, and, as I was able to notice, an equal number of men and women. The poster said: "Problems of the radical restructuring of the economy." But the first notes proposed expanding the framework of the conversation.

"With a truly radical restructuring of the economy dangerous changes may begin in social life, casting doubt on the monopoly of power of the party leadership centrally and locally. What do you think, will the response to this not be repressions of a Stalinist nature?"

I think that the "monopoly of power of the party leadership" and the CPSU's leading role in society envisaged in the USSR Constitution are by no means one and the same thing. As we all know, restructuring includes the fundamental restructuring of the methods, form, and style of party work.

The "monopoly of power" opposes the development of democracy, self-administration, openness, the firm observance of legality, and the growth of the masses' autonomy and social activeness. Conversely, the leading role requires that party leaders of any rank really implement the democratic principles proclaimed by the 27th CPSU Congress.

When in Uzbekistan and several other regions the party leaders were among those who were drawn into corruption, when in Moldavia and Kirovograd Oblast the party committees encouraged the exaggeration of data and even pushed economic leaders toward it; when in the Ukraine some party figures even in our day have not stopped at persecuting people for criticism with the aid of unprincipled people from the organs called on to stand guard over the law and justice (our press has reported such outrageous instances), then here we are dealing with an obvious desire for "the monopoly of power." With the habit of uncontrolled power accountable to no one and ignoring public morality and legality. Truth and openness are fatal for those who embark on this path. But it is truth and openness which are gradually becoming the norms of our life in accordance with the policy of society's democratic transformation.

Is a return to the repressions of the thirties possible? I am asked. If not now, then in the future?

I know that at one level of public consciousness this can happen (and has happened!) and at another it cannot.

It cannot happen in a society in which the syndrome of submissiveness to a higher authority has been eradicated, in which people are not cowed by fear and suspicion, in which criticism is accepted as the norm and the press freely informs citizens about everything happening in the people's life, in which there are no untouchable leaders not subject to public control, in which there is no dual morality, lawlessness, or social injustice, in which people voice their opinion without fear of reprisal...

I believe that we are now building just such a society and are striving toward it. And we want not only its political, ideological, and general cultural superstructure but also its economic basis to be founded on openness, on universal commitment and truth. Without exaggerated data, without the embezzlement and squandering of the people's property, without laziness, without stupidity in administration, without hack work, without the degrading degree of habituation to the mediocrity, unreliability, and seamanship of what we produce. Do we already have this society? An honest man will say: Not yet. There are many elements of it and a clear goal. There is a historical chance of creating such a society: Socialism, which enjoys, without any reservations and forced interpretations, high prestige among our compatriots and in the whole world.

If we do not achieve this, if we grow tired of advancing, if we stop and backslide and sacrifice openness—who can say how much more burning sand will bury our caravan? But I believe in the irreversibility of the present development, in the success of the aims proclaimed by the party congress which perhaps accord more than ever with my fellow citizens' aspirations.

"Do you believe that we must change the overbureaucratized middle echelon, as has been done in the top echelon? After all, it is the middle echelon which is stifling all attempts at restructuring."

"The bureaucratic apparatus stifled the 1965 reform. What guarantees are there that the situation has changed?"

"Don't you think that we should halve the apparatus of the sectorial ministries or even do away with them entirely?"

It seems to me that in these questions truth lies alongside illusions. In the fifties Valentin Ovechkin, who had published his famous essays on the need for changes in the management of agriculture, gave a picture of how leadership should not be exercised. But he believed that it was enough to replace the conservative Borzov with the progressive Martynov in the rayon leadership—and everything would immediately improve. And the Martynovs came and with age they themselves became Borzovs: The principles of management—administrative, and not economic—remained the same. As before, farms received directives on what they should do on their own land and how, what they should grow, and how much they should pay. What could a real Martynov do here? Bang his head against the wall?

Enterprises must have full financial autonomy and economic independence. With just as full—economic!—responsibility for results.

It is not, in my view, a question of completely replacing the "overbureaucratized middle echelon" and not of reducing several times over the indeed inflated apparatus of the departments. I do not think that a quantitative "halved" bureaucracy is less dangerous. Even one petty tyrant can put a spoke in the wheel. The problem is not the apparatus' numerical strength but its functions.

I believe ministries are needed, but not in their present form. In my view, the sectorial headquarters should retain the functions of coordination and leadership in the field of scientific and technical progress and they have a great part to play in planning and apportioning the overall sectorial target between associations and enterprises and distributing the still limited resources. But here we should embark on a fundamental reform: relieving ministries of responsibility for the results of enterprises' activity.

Perhaps this will seem strange to some people: How is this conceivable under conditions of centralized planning? But let's discuss it. By law our state even now is not responsible for the financial and economic results of enterprises' work. Yet the fullest possible demand is made on the ministries,

which are essentially only the hands of the state. It is illogical. Under such conditions departments themselves are interested in a low plan target and are inclined to juggle with statistics, to produce exaggerated data, and to fulfill the plan at any price, including by breaking the law.

I shall say once again: Let the associations be responsible for everything economically--through their money and the wages of leaders and workers!

"Will laws change in the spirit of restructuring?... "Why is it necessary to have an overfulfillment of the plan, leading to imbalances in the economy?..." "Do you believe that the development of financial autonomy and the organization of production on the basis of commodity-money relations could lead to unemployment and do you accept it?..." "Will the policy of pricing for foodstuffs change?..." "Who could be a millionaire in our country and can there be any millionaires at all?..." "What sum expresses the budget deficit caused by the anti-alcohol campaign?..."

I will not set myself the task of repeating all my replies. But the nature of the questions is interesting in itself. Some 24 notes from an audience of no more than 130. One out of every five! And there were many more questions from the floor. We talked until nearly midnight. The activeness and desire for openness were obvious.

Why am I particularly highlighting notes about leadership? Ideas become barren flowers unless there are people at all levels who want to implement them and know how to do so. There is a certain dialectic contradiction here. Ideas shape a leader worthy of them but the leader, depending on his own, sometimes not overpublicized goals, can extract the soul from the very best social idea, leaving behind only its formal husk. That is why both the very summit, the party Central Committee, and any one of the writers center debates so commonplace in our time look closely at the problem of cadres.

"But do our troubles not come from the unreliable mechanism for selecting honest, talented, industrious cadres--patriots who love their country, not their own pocket--and promoting them to leading posts? Not the nomenklatura system, not string-pulling, but real elections and competition--that is what is needed. Well, fine, M. S. Gorbachev has taken over the leadership, but what if he had not? If things had not gone well? I repeat, there must be a mechanism for selecting the best cadres, bringing to the top only those who implement in practice our society's program goals. Do you believe there should be a system of competitiveness even for the country's top leadership?"

This is the final note and in principle I share the opinion set forth in the form of a question. In my view it fully accords with the present course. In the absence of openness no one can judge the quality of a rayon leader or the merits of a top leader. Many people did not connect the lawlessness of Stalin's time with Stalin personally but said: "It is being kept from him," "He is being misinformed," "They are acting behind his back."

Today the press conferences of party and state leaders broadcast on radio and television and meetings on streets with people in various cities shown to everyone enable the ordinary person to compose his own opinion. And to act in accordance with the convictions he has formed—to offer active support if so prompted by his conscience or to offer secret or overt resistance, which is what those who do not like the course are doing.

I understand the man who sent one note: He, like me, would like the most important institutions of our democracy, including the traditionally formed electoral system and the forms of the work of soviets of all levels, right up to the country's parliament, not to remain outside the restructuring. Yes, we all want a restructuring that is not cosmetic but profound, affecting all aspects of the life of Soviet society.

But has anyone ever walked kilometers without walking the first few meters? We are on our way. And we must advance step by step.

/9599

CSO: 1800/301

SOCIAL ISSUES

USSR JUSTICE MINISTER ADDRESSES READERS' CONCERNS

PMO61240 Moscow CHELOVEK I ZAKON in Russian No. 1, Jan 87 (Signed to Press 21 Nov 86) pp 6-13

[Interview with B.V. Kravtsov, USSR Minister of Justice: "Time for Action"--date and place unspecified]

[Text] It is almost one year since the 27th CPSU Congress. This is a short period but enough to analyze its decisions and think about practical steps to more effectively implement those decisions. The journal's readers are keenly interested in the role of the courts and justice organs and establishments in carrying out the plans outlined by the party.

B.V. Kravtsov, USSR Minister of Justice, answered certain questions from the editorial mailbag put to him by the letters editor.

[Letters Editor] As is well known, the party Central Committee demands that the work of the prosecutor's offices, the militia, the courts, and other law enforcement organs be consistently restructured. Many readers, Boris Vasilyevich, are interested in the ways in which the USSR Ministry of Justice is pursuing this work.

[Kravtsov] In terms of scale the tasks posed by the 27th CPSU Congress of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development surpass everything that our people have had to implement in the past.

What does restructuring mean to us?

The congress documents clearly reveal the demand for the need to constantly strengthen the legal basis of state and public life and to improve the legal backup for the tasks that have been set. To this end we must step up our bill-drafting activity, take measures to improve the standard of legal work in the national economy, and considerably improve the work to systematize and codify legislation.

The problems of creating virtually a new system of running the national economy and restructuring the economic mechanism require the preparation and adoption of many new and very important legal acts. I recall that the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th Party Congress directly pointed out: "Our legislation must help even more actively to introduce economic

management methods, to effectively monitor the amount of labor and consumption, and to implement the principles of social justice."

We have to improve the quality of Soviet laws even further. The work of ministries and departments in generalizing the practice of the use of legislation in the management sectors entrusted to them and the drawing up on this basis of proposals to improve legislation should be an important means for achieving this. However, this work is not yet being carried out at the proper level. Order must be instilled in this area. In my opinion we ought to stipulate these questions in the plans for the work of ministries and departments. Unfortunately, this is currently not being done.

Pride of place in the activity of all justice organs goes to the questions of strengthening socialist legality, safeguarding state interests and citizens' rights, and participating along with other state organs in fighting crime. The main form taken by our work to implement these tasks is in providing organizational guidance for the courts and helping them to carry out the goals of justice.

The acceleration of the transition by national economic sectors to complete financial autonomy and self-financing demands considerable improvements in their legal work. Among the specific avenues of this work I would spotlight the range of problems linked with output quality. The most important task of the legal service today is to promote the consistent use together with economic levers of legal measures to combat shoddy workmanship.

The methodological leadership and coordination of the work of state organs and public organizations in propagandizing legal knowledge and explaining legislation to the population need to be further improved.

Currently legal education is objectively being highlighted as a means of stepping up the human factor. In the CPSU Program it is spotlighted as an independent and important avenue of ideological work. We must link legal propaganda in the closest manner with life, with the tasks of the country's socioeconomic development, with the deepening of socialist democracy, and with the strengthening of discipline, legality, and law and order. That is our task today.

[Letters Editor] Our readers often ask: What new laws will be enacted in the near future? Please tell us about some of the legislative instruments whose development is envisaged by the plan for the drafting of USSR legislation and USSR Government resolutions and proposals for improving USSR legislation in 1986-1990.

[Kravtsov] First of all I must say that this plan is directly bound up with the provision of a legal framework for the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. The decisions envisage the preparation of new legislation designed to promote the strengthening of socialist legality and the defense of law and order. It is planned to draw up important legislative instruments on the questions of further developing democracy and socialist self-management and citizens' rights and freedoms. Among these one can mention the law on the procedure for nationwide discussion and voting on major questions of the

country's life and on discussing draft local Soviet decisions with the population; and the law on the procedure for lodging complaints in court about the unlawful conduct of officials who have encroached upon citizens' rights.

Legislation in the sphere of improving the economic mechanism and the running of the national economy, accelerating scientific and technical progress, and ensuring the high quality of output will be further developed. In particular, a law on socialist enterprises (associations) is being drawn up. It is planned to give enterprises greater economic independence [samostoyatel'nost'] and at the same time to increase their responsibility for the results of their activity and for the fulfillment of contractual commitments and state plan targets. Legislative instruments aimed at boosting the role of social organizations and labor collectives in running state affairs and at ensuring that the democratic principles enshrined in the law on labor collectives are translated into everyday concrete practice will be enacted.

In the sphere of legislation on questions of social development a USSR Council of Ministers resolution on holding more than one job and a legislative instrument on further incentives for pensioners to participate in social production are being prepared.

[Letters Editor] Judges and justice organ workers have to get to know the new laws quickly and skillfully. At the same time certain judicial processes are still conducted at a low professional level and there are cases of citizens being groundlessly convicted. Lawyers and legal counsels are not always able to provide competent advice. Does this mean that the pace of the improvement of legislation is outstripping the opportunities for practical workers to improve their skills? Or does the fault lie with shortcomings in the training, selection, and education of cadres?

[Kravtsov] It must be admitted that the negative phenomena you have mentioned do indeed still occur in the activity of courts and justice organ workers. However, I think it would be wrong and hardly possible to provide a pat answer about the cause of these phenomena. The fact is that they are based on a whole range of interrelated factors. For instance, judges' skills and practical experience and their attitudes to the case they are hearing affect the quality of court proceedings in equal measure. At any rate, the main reason, of course, is not that court workers or lawyers cannot come to grips with the new legislation.

Practical workers are notified in good time about all new legal acts and all changes to legal acts. Checks are periodically carried out to see how new legislation is applied locally. Any necessary assistance is provided. Active work in this direction is carried out by the All-union Institute for Improving the Training of Justice Workers and the republic courses for improving judges' qualifications. Study of legislation and judicial practice is extensively conducted at seminars during their probationary period. All this is having tangible results. Suffice it to say that in the last few years the percentage of sentences repealed or amended on appeal or following a review has fallen considerably as a result of the improvement in the quality of resolving criminal cases.

Yet nonetheless there are shortcomings in the courts' work. Incidentally, it must be said that errors committed by judges through ignorance of the law are an extremely rare phenomenon. Violations are most often the consequence of inattentiveness or a superficial approach to the study of the evidence or the circumstances of a case. There are instances when judges underestimate the social danger of what has been done or, on the contrary, return convictions for actions which cannot be considered criminal because of their insignificance or other grounds stipulated by the law. Such cases constitute more than half of those dismissed by higher courts.

For instance, the Oktyabrskiy Rayon People's Court in Perm Oblast sentenced citizen Matveyeva to one year's imprisonment for taking an R1.5 plastic bag from her friend Lvova's apartment without permission. With no explanation the case seems simply absurd. But there is more to it than that. It seems that Matveyeva had been accused of stealing a gold ring. The accusation did not stand up in court, but since the defendant had been detained it was necessary to "justify" the arrest, which was done to suit the prosecutor. The case was, of course, thrown out by a higher court.

The USSR Ministry of Justice gears the courts to the need to build their relations with other law enforcement organs exclusively on a principled, legal basis.

Instances of blatant lawbreaking, including the conviction of innocent citizens, were recently revealed in Irkutsk, Moscow, and certain other RSFSR oblasts, and in Belorussia and Latvia. And whatever explanation we may proffer, one thing is certain: This is the most serious and costly shortcoming in our work.

Every day thousands of citizens are involved with the activity of the people's courts, and over the course of a year the figure runs into the millions. Judgments are made about us and, on the whole accurately, about the face of justice on the basis of the work of the people's courts, the way that citizens' rights and interests are protected in actual courtrooms, and the behavior and attitude to citizens shown by all court workers—from chairman to secretaries. That is why we view as a prime task the need to radically improve the work of the courts and justice organs and establishments linked with the administration of justice. The way to achieve this is to improve the personal responsibility—and, of course, demandingness and accountability—of everyone.

[Letters Editor] But people administer justice, and it is hardly likely to be possible to rule out all mistakes. That is understandable. It is why the law provides for a clear-cut process of appeal, protest, and review of judicial sentences, decisions, rulings, and resolutions. At the same time the editorial office receives many letters complaining about the rudeness of judges, lawyers, and notaries, and about the red tape involved in hearing cases. You will agree that it is quite impossible to rule out shortcomings of this kind. Yet what should a citizen who encounters such phenomena do?

[Kravtsov] Of course, the people's courts are not institutions that bring people sheer pleasure. The courts do difficult and painstaking work to

investigate, as a rule, the shady side of life and to educate people. I agree that this work should therefore be conducted calmly and in a civilized manner with the highest level of objectivity and with equal attention to everyone drawn into its orbit.

I must say that we too receive many complaints about the actions of justice organ workers and court workers. Each complaint is checked in the most thorough fashion and, if confirmed, the relevant measures are taken. Main attention is devoted to eradicating the causes that give rise to justified complaints. I mean boosting work standards and eradicating red tape when examining cases and carrying out rulings.

The fundamentals of USSR and union republic legislation on the judiciary envisage a special procedure for disciplining judges for violations committed in the administration of justice. Each instance of violation of the rules of procedure or service ethics are carefully examined by colleagues specializing in disciplinary matters and corresponding measures are taken against those guilty, including the early recall of judges who have failed to justify the trust placed in them by the voters.

[Letters Editor] Our readers say that the courts often schedule several hearings at the same time. What real measures are being taken to reduce the time lost by those who are summoned to take part in trials? Citizens called as witnesses sometimes show up in court in the morning on time and then have to wait hours before the hearing starts. On other occasions the whole of one day and the next day may be spent waiting to be called to testify.

[Kravtsov] Examination of witnesses during a trial is one way of obtaining the necessary proof in a case. It is understandably hard to strictly define how long it will take to examine any one witness. Obtaining accurate and authentic evidence is a complex process. A great deal depends not only on the professional training of the judges, lawyers, and prosecutor but also on the witness himself. If the witness is not conscientious about his duties, fails several times to appear in court, and gives contradictory evidence, it naturally takes longer to hear a case.

And yet there is a problem with regard to the unjustifiable diversion of working people from their work.

Certain courts are still uncritical in their examination of the investigators' lists of people to be called during a trial. In this regard secondary witnesses whose evidence has no substantive importance for the correct resolution of the case are called during trials. Witnesses who have previously been examined during a court session are recalled. Unjustified requests to and by judges to step down are accepted. In people's courts the practice of deferring examination of cases is still widespread. For instance, in just two months the Sovetskiy Rayon People's Court in Orel Oblast deferred the hearing of 26 criminal cases and civil actions. This involved the recall of over 60 people.

The solution to all these problems depends first and foremost on the courts and justice organ workers. But I would pose the question of unjustifiably

keeping people away from their work somewhat more widely. I do not only mean improving the courts' activity. It is necessary to arrange matters so that citizens can solve all or at least most of their legal questions in their free time, including the obtaining of legal aid, the drawing up of notarial actions, and so forth. It is also extremely important to make justice organs' working practices as convenient as possible for working people in connection with the transition of certain enterprises in the industrial and construction sectors to two- and three-shift working.

In taking measures to eradicate these shortcomings and in restructuring the work of our services, we have unexpectedly encountered another problem. The fact is that the population rarely apply to legal establishments during morning (0800 to 0900) and evening (1900 to 2000) reception hours or on their days off. Yet there has been no reduction in applications during worktime. We still have serious work to do on this question. I think that we will find a way to resolve it.

[Letters Editor] The editorial office receives thousands of letters complaining about nonexecution of court orders. The overwhelming majority are about alimony cases. Who should ensure that court orders are carried out? What measures are being taken to improve this work? These questions are asked by N. Levchenko of Belgorod Oblast, G. Sokolova of Kostroma, and many other readers.

[Kravtsov] The execution of court orders is the area of our work which generates the most acute criticism and an unending stream of complaints. On the basis of each communication—and it is mainly mothers who write—checks are carried out and the necessary measures taken. However, we must not relax our efforts in this area.

Along with cases of unconscientious attitudes to the execution of orders by court officials—such cases unfortunately exist—a considerable number of complaints are generated by unlawful conduct on the part of alimony debtors who maliciously avoid payments under executive orders and often change their places of work and residence. The action taken by internal affairs organ workers to find such people is by no means always effective.

Searches are sometimes delayed, the state entails considerable expenditure, and children continue to suffer material hardship.

In order to solve this problem the USSR Council of Ministers in February 1984 adopted the resolution "On the Introduction of Temporary Allowances for Minors During the Search for Their Parents Who Are Avoiding Alimony Payments."

Since 1 January 1985 social welfare organs have been providing alimony claimants with allowances for minors at their places of residence during the hunt for absconders. Alimony debtors must repay these sums in full plus an additional 10 percent.

The law also stipulates the criminal liability of individuals who maliciously avoid paying alimony as maintenance for their children.

It is well known that many proposals are made about envisaging additional measures—including legislation—to prevent alimony debtors from being able to disappear without trace from their workplaces and travel from city to city. We are studying these proposals attentively.

[Letters Editor] With the entry into force of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree "On the Intensification of the Struggle Against Drunkenness" the editorial office has started receiving considerably more letters complaining about the nonadoption of measures against cases of drunkenness and, on this basis, hooliganism, parasitism, and crimes against citizens' lives and health.

[Kravtsov] I do not believe it can be claimed that the numerous letters of this sort are the result of inactivity on the part of the courts or law enforcement organs. We view as a positive factor the increase in the number of letters in which citizens express their negative attitude to these phenomena. It undoubtedly attests to the growing civic activeness of the population. In recent years the work of the law enforcement organs and courts to combat drunkenness and crimes committed while intoxicated or under the influence of drink has notably increased. This work has particularly been stepped up in connection with the well-known CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions and the directives issued by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and union republic Supreme Soviet Presidiums aimed at resolutely eradicating drunkenness and alcoholism.

I should note that no shortage of laws was felt previously, although a whole series of substantive amendments has been introduced. The actual approach to solving the problem has changed. The following facts in particular attest to certain positive changes.

The number of convictions—including convictions of minors—for crimes committed under the influence of drink has fallen. I would stress that we are not talking about some insignificant infraction but about a reduction in the number of murders, cases of grievous bodily harm, rape, robbery, and theft. And the reductions have been quite substantial: 15-20 percent for certain crimes.

The number of people sent by the courts for compulsory alcoholism treatment at labor therapy clinics has increased considerably.

In 1985 convictions for moonshining increased by 150 percent in comparison with 1984 and by 500 percent in comparison with 1980.

There is greater order in the streets, public places, on transportation, and at enterprises.

[Letters Editor] Our readers are also interested in the practical application of the unearned income legislation. And often not just as passive observers. Many of them assume really active civic stances and give real assistance to law enforcement organs. However, the approach to this problem is not the same everywhere. As an example I will cite a letter from the editorial mailbox. "I am 72 years old," Tukhvatulina writes from Tashkent Oblast. "As I was able

to, I knitted some white woolen headscarves. I paid the tax. Now they have taken my patent, saying that this is unearned income. But headscarves do not knit themselves. Other old women are allowed to knit socks. I do not know how to do that, but I cannot sit around doing nothing. Please explain why you can knit socks but not headscarves!"

[Kravtsov] I must say that the wide interest in the questions of combating unearned income is entirely natural. The broad offensive against all kinds of grafters, money-grubbers, speculators, and bribe-takers is totally supported and approved by the working people. Everything that is socially unjust must be extirpated from our socialist society. But distortions in this work are impermissible. Honest people must be sure that their conscientious work and their earned income are reliably protected by the law.

The right of citizens to pursue individual labor activity has been further developed with the adoption of a special law last November.

As for Tukhvatulina, we will deal with this question locally and give the writer an exhaustive answer.

[Letters Editor] Since amendments establishing responsibility for libel continued in anonymous letters were put on the union republics' statute books, law enforcement organs have been obliged to take measures to identify and punish the guilty. How is this legal rule being implemented in practice?

[Kravtsov] Liability for the spreading of false and defamatory fabrications (libel) against another individual is one of the guarantees of the protection of Soviet citizens' honor and dignity enshrined by Article 57 of the USSR Constitution.

Law enforcement organs are taking measures—not very actively as yet, but nonetheless they are taking measures—against people who spread anonymous libelous letters. Such people receive severe punishments, up to and including imprisonment.

I will cite an example. Ryazhikh, a citizen of the city of Nikolayeva, received an anonymous letter maligning her husband. The "facts" it quoted were sheer fabrication. The anonymous writer was identified and appeared in court. It turned out to be a certain Kazarina who worked at the same factory as Ryazhikh's husband.

The Leninskiy Rayon People's Court in Nikolayeva convicted Kazarina for the libel contained in the anonymous letter.

[Letters Editor] I would like to quote an extract from quite a typical letter: "I am writing to you on the advice of Yurasova, legal counsel in Sovetskiy Rayon," writes Karkhanova from Gorkiy. "Your journal has already helped a resident of our city to solve a similar question." What question is this? A dispute over the right to an area of land in a horticultural association [tovarishchestvo]. We receive 2-3,000 letters every day. Most of them are about questions directly relating to the conduct of the courts, the prosecutor's office, or the justice organs. It is clear from Karkhanova's

example that even lawyers do not always give citizens the assistance they need. But why are newspaper or journal editorial offices often chosen as a last resort?

[Kravtsov] Unfortunately—and we make no secret of this—certain lawyers do not carry out their duties in the proper manner. That is clear from the example you have quoted. Certain workers are negligent and inattentive, sometimes gearing their efforts to the remuneration that will be obtained. The help given by such lawyers both to their clients and to justice is often worthless. It is particularly important to rectify this abnormal situation under modern circumstances.

Nor should we fail to take account of many citizens' ignorance of their legal rights and privileges and the legal procedure for settling specific legal matters.

At the same time the mass media, particularly in recent years, have started publishing large quantities of legal material. Thus, one of the reasons for the numerous letters to newspaper and journal editorial offices requesting legal assistance is quite obvious.

But why do you get letters which are clearly the concern of law enforcement organs? Is it a question of ignorance of the procedure for formulating statements and complaints? No. The overwhelming majority of the writers of such letters are well aware of the procedure.

There are many reasons. I would like to spotlight what I see as the most substantive of them. The first is the nonadoption locally of proper measures to protect citizens' violated rights and their legally protected interests. The second is the inattentive attitude of officials to the examination of statements and complaints. And the third is the dispatch of statements and complaints for resolution by the very organs or officials whose actions are being criticized. If complaints are sent to the person the writer is complaining about, he can hardly expect that it will be examined attentively and objectively or, consequently, that his violated rights will be restored.

We cannot fail to take account of the role of press organs in eradicating these negative phenomena. At the same time, the contribution made by the mass media, including the CHELOVEK I ZAKON editorial office, in eradicating bureaucracy, departmentalism, and parochial tendencies can and should be weightier. Discussions about the most important questions of legal work are still infrequent in newspapers and journals and there are few constructive proposals about improving legal work. I would like to see more items containing in-depth analysis of the causes of negative phenomena.

/12913

CSO: 1800/309

SOCIAL ISSUES

MOSCOW NEWS REPORTS ON ENTRY, EXIT VISA SYSTEM

PN271105 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 4, 25 Jan 87 p 8

[Andrey Muratov report: "New Regulations"; first graf is editorial introduction; grafs two through ten are boxed off from remainder of text by thick black lines]

[Text] At the request of readers Sebastien Bricard (France), Hilario Segura Ponce (Spain), and Vladimir Kondratenko (Czechoslovakia), an MN correspondent reports from the agencies responsible for issuing permission for entering and leaving the Soviet Union.

[Boxed section begins] On 1 January 1987 additional Regulations on entering and leaving the USSR, introduced by the Resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers of 28 August 1986, came into force. Why were the changes necessary and what are they all about?

Last spring, the final document of the international Bern conference was prepared for signing. It was to include an agreement on contacts between people. The position taken by the United States prevented the signing of the document. Its draft, which had been agreed on by the members of the Bern meeting, became the basis for the additional regulations mentioned above.

The additional Regulations on entering and leaving this country have now been published, and the press has carried commentaries on them.

Therefore, the people now applying for permission to leave this country, either temporarily or for good, many refer to the newspaper publications and the complex text of the Soviet Government's Resolution. What changes have been introduced?

Paragraph 20 of the Regulations asserts that the questions concerning contacts between people shall be resolved in keeping with the principle of equality of all citizens before the law, without distinction of origin, social or property status, race or nationality, sex, education, language, attitude to religion or other circumstances.

It stipulates that as of 1 January, not only the applications for being reunited with a husband, wife, father, mother, son or daughter living abroad shall be considered, but also with a brother or sister, even though the

brother and sister may not belong to the same family. Other formalities permitting, exit is also allowed at the invitation of other relatives.

The additional Regulations clarify the grounds for entering or leaving the USSR for personal reasons, for instance: reuniting with members of one's family, a visit to relatives, getting married, seeing seriously ill relatives, paying homage to the graves of close relatives or settling inheritance problems. Other valid reasons may also be taken into consideration.

As far as the time allowed for formalities is concerned, the new edition of the Regulations says the following: "An application for a temporary entrance to or exit from the USSR visa for personal reasons shall be considered with maximum expedition, as a rule, within a month. In the event of the travel being necessitated by the death or illness of a relative, the permit should be granted within three days. Applications for entrance to and exit from the USSR for permanent residence shall be, as a rule, considered within a month." Thus, the basic points are clearly defined and do not permit of any misinterpretation.

The formalities have been simplified. If a person has earlier received a refusal and applies again for an exit permit, the papers submitted earlier can be reconsidered, provided no changes have occurred in the person's circumstances since the time the papers were last produced. [boxed section ends]

The waiting rooms of the agencies responsible for granting visas and registering private travellers bring to mind the doctors' and notaries' waiting rooms. Visitors seem reticent and unsociable. Who knows what an applicant might come with: Joy, sorrow or hope?

The first visitor I met in the office of Ilya Karakulko, Deputy Chief of the Moscow Department for Visas and Registration, was Maria Dean, a middle-aged woman seeking to join her husband in Britain. She had been to the Department before. Her application had been considered and turned down. She does not know why. (By the way, according to the new Regulations, the motives for a refusal must be made known to the applicant.)

"You have to produce the invitation," Ilya Karakulko told her.

"But the new Regulations assert that the previous papers are enough."

"You last applied two years ago. The invitation is only valid for six months. You definitely need a new one. Apart from this formal reason, it's understandable that all sorts of changes might have occurred in the meantime. One can't exclude the possibility—I don't mean you personally, of course—that the invitation might not be renewed even. As for the copy of a birth certificate and other papers, you won't have to get new copies."

Indian citizen (Kanhaiya Lal Verma) seeks an early decision that would allow his daughters to leave for India during the forthcoming student holidays. He is at present living and working in Moscow, and has timed his annual vacation so as to go back home with his children.

He was informed that all the necessary papers had been produced and complications were unlikely. The one thing that was lacking was the application from his elder daughter. Like any Soviet citizen over 14 years of age, she should apply for exit papers on her own.

Vladimir S. asked me not to use his full name in the newspaper. He is leaving his grown-up sons behind in Moscow, who have been pleading with him to stay. They will not be pleased with the public announcement of their father's decision. What has prompted it? Vladimir's life has been difficult. During the war, as a teenage boy he was taken to Germany, then lived in Canada and other countries. In 1954, he returned to his native country, began working, received the degree of a Candidate of Technical Science and the post of senior research associate in a research institute. However, he is sure he could have achieved more and make a brilliant career if it had not been for a prejudiced attitude to him as a "displaced person."

He has received permission to leave the USSR, and he will meet his relatives who have sent him the invitation. They have not met since before the war, and hardly remember one another. This is a big change in Vladimir's life, something that gets more and more difficult with years.

The working day at the Moscow visa department continues. Deputy Chief Ilya Karakulko receives visitors together with senior inspector Irina Molodtsova. She provides consultation and issues papers. She registered the temporary residence permit for Lyudmila Struza, who permanently resides in Greece but retains Soviet citizenship. Lyudmila had come to Moscow for three months with her children to see relatives. Soviet citizen Natalya Romanella had come from Italy on an invitation. Lyudmila Manannikova wants to see her relatives in West Berlin.

A young man who came in next told the inspector his story. German Manafov was 10 when his mother had left for Austria with him. They then lived in West Germany and India. Not a very diligent or successful pupil, he took to the drugs, became addicted and soon fell seriously ill. To use his own words, he was happy to get back to his native country. He underwent treatment and was cured. Now at 19, German has applied for a permanent residence permit in the USSR. He plans to find a job and attend evening classes. His fiancée helped him word his application, which reads, in particular: "I don't want to return to the West."

"Has the number of people seeking to leave this country for personal reasons risen since the new Regulations came into effect?"

My question was addressed to Militia Colonel Rudolf Kuznetsov, Chief of the Visa and Registration Department of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

"We have not noticed any sharp increase as yet. Members of our staff have to work harder, though because they have to explain to every visitor that the Regulations cover many concrete situations, but not all. The text of the regulations indicates this in Paragraph 21: 'The procedure for applying for and registering entrance to and exit from the USSR is stipulated by the present Regulations, by other legislative acts of the USSR and the

instructions published in accordance with them by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Marriage-related questions are also regulated by the instructions of the USSR Ministry of Justice.' The instructions are being prepared, but have not yet been approved."

"As far as the practical results of the implementation of the additional Regulations are concerned, I'd rather we returned to this topic in a few months' time."

"There must be disputable cases, when the applicant interprets this or that regulation in his or her favour..."

"The final decision on the citizens' applications for entrance to or exit from the USSR is made by the agencies of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. However, if one disagrees with the decision, one has the right to appeal to the procurator's office, which supervises the activities of militia in general, and the agencies granting entrance and exit permits in particular. [no end quotes as published]

A man entered Rudolf Kuznetsov's office, sat hesitantly on the edge of a chair and handed in his application, in which he, Rafael Aslanov, said he wanted to leave the country. It also mentioned a relative, "my own aunt's husband's brother," living abroad, and the relatives living in this country: a wife, a child, parents, and brothers. He said he decided to leave them all because he could no longer bear the injustice which he appeared powerless to overcome.

The problem was this: Rafael was dismissed from the railroad where he held the post of assistant engine driver. He was convinced the dismissal was unjust. He did not manage to justify himself in Baku, where he lived and worked. So he went to Moscow, to the Ministry of Railways of the USSR, where he was told that he was not to blame for the incident which had led to his dismissal. However, this did not help his predicament. When he returned home, his straightforward manner and inability to forget the wrong did not allow him to find a job to his specialty, but he would not settle for anything else. Quite a long time passed since then, and finally he found himself applying for an exit visa.

"Suppose I give you the permission you seek," Kuznetsov pleaded with Rafael. "What are you going to do abroad? What kind of livelihood will you make there?"

"I don't have to leave!"

"What have you come here for, then?"

"I want you to help me. Please ring the Ministry officer up and say: you have wronged the man so deeply that he even wants to emigrate."

A sad story, isn't it? Kuznetsov promised to ring up and help, as he had done many times before...

/12913

CSO: 1800/308

SOCIAL ISSUES

LAX PENALTIES IN 1982 UKRAINE CORRUPTION CASE EXPOSED

PM301353 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Jan 87 p 13

[Article by Yuriy Shchekochikhin: "One Day on a Quiet Street"]

[Text] "On the evening of 2 October 1982 a militia UAZ automobile drove up to the doors of house No 12 on quiet Kavaleriyskaya Street in Dnepropetrovsk. Anatoliy Stepanovich Kalalb, the house's owner, asked in surprise: "What's the matter?"--but he was gently pushed toward the door of the automobile: "Go on, go on... You'll be home in half an hour."

He did not return home that evening.

That was how, 3 years ago, I began my article about this event.

I found my manuscript in the lower drawer of my desk, at the very bottom in a pile of uncompleted notes, letters, and documents. The paper on which the article was written had become yellow and crisp over the years. Indeed the actual occurrence already seemed no more than an ancient fact from my past life: What did it matter what had happened then, in 1982?

On many occasions I had intended to clear out my archives, to throw out everything which it was time to forget and even what I wanted to forget. Fortunately, I had not thrown it out, I had not had the time.

Treat archives from the recent past more carefully! The time is not yet ripe! The past is obstinately knocking on our doors and the shadow it casts reaches us today, does not leave us in peace, attracts us like a magnet: Where have you been running?!

And it was a letter which arrived from Dnepropetrovsk early this January which unexpectedly made me return to a story which I had considered to be relegated to the archives. To be relegated to that year, to that October.

The UAZ automobile took Anatoliy Stepanovich Kalalb to the militia--the Kirovskiy Rayon internal affairs section. There were six men sitting in the room where he was taken, some in uniform, some in civilian clothes, and it seemed to him they were looking at him with curiosity, as though he were an

interesting and long-awaited interlocutor. "Guys, what's the matter?" Anatoliy Stepanovich asked again. "What's the panic?..."

And they began to explain it to him. First calmly and even soothingly: A persistent offender had indicated that it was to No 12 Kavaleriyskaya Street that he had taken a Japanese stereo tape recorder and since the tape recorder was stolen, it was Anatoliy Stepanovich's duty to admit the fact and thus help the investigation to back up the criminal's evidence with proof. That was why he had been taken there "for half an hour" in the hope that he would display acuity and frankness. "I only have a Soviet tape recorder, a Yupiter 202 with its certificate," A. S. Kalalb objected. "Just admit it. Admit it and you can go home," one of the six men, the investigator, interrupted patiently. "A mistake, comrades! Let's have this criminal! Check it out once again!..."

The voices in the room started to get louder and abuse was rained down on Anatoliy Stepanovich.

And when a chair was held over his head he wrote to the investigator's dictation what he was asked to write: Yes, I bought the tape recorder, yes, it was Japanese. But when the chair was returned to its place and his interlocutors breathed a sigh of relief, Kalalb took the dictated confession and tore it into small pieces, that is, in the militia's opinion, he committed "a typical act of hooliganism."

That is why Anatoliy Stepanovich spent that night in a cell.

The following morning Viktor Kalalb, Anatoliy Stepanovich's younger brother, arrived on leave from far-off Surgut. And he immediately went to the Kirovskiy Rayon section where it was explained to him that "your brother is a criminal and will go to prison." When he returned home Viktor asked his wife to put together a few items of food for Anatoliy and in the evening he returned to the militia. For some reason they were pleased to see him: "It's a good thing you've come. Now let's go home and carry out a search." Viktor knew from detective stories that a warrant from the prosecutor's office was needed for a search. For some reason the word "warrant" offended the investigator. Two witnesses were brought in from a neighboring room and were given some papers to sign and Viktor was sent to a cell--for being "too clever."

The house on quiet Kavaleriyskaya Street was orphaned, so to speak.

But the next day it was full of unexpected guests: Ten men came to search it. They brought Anatoliy Stepanovich with them, but to prevent him from interfering they handcuffed him to a radiator. It was in this position, sitting on the floor for 8 hours, that he watched them smash his cupboards, overturn his furniture, and sound the floor boards. There was no "Japanese stereo tape recorder" anywhere but there were items in the house which in the searchers' opinion could have been acquired by criminal means: a winter hat, a jacket, a best suit, a hanging on the wall, a wedding ring, a radio receiver from an old Zaporozhets, three bottles of wine in the refrigerator, and tubes

of shaving cream (which were perhaps in short supply in Dnepropetrovsk at the time). They took everything they considered to be of any value, worth a ruble or more. Some 500 articles and items of food were listed in the search record and they drove a bus to the house on Kavaleriyskaya Street to take them away.

Neighbors stopped near the doors in surprise, not understanding what was happening at the Kalalb house: Were they burglars, were they shooting a movie, or was it a dream? Someone wanted to call the militia: Help! Burglars! But the things were brought out by well-built boys in militia uniform. Whom then could they telephone?

The third night the brothers Anatoliy and Viktor spent in the same cell and in the morning they were taken in turn to the Kirovskiy Rayon people's court building. As the elder brother, Anatoliy Stepanovich was sentenced to 15 days and the younger, Viktor, was fined R50. "But what for?" Anatoliy Stepanovich asked indignantly. "What will I tell people! I'm the shop party organizer!" Next to the judge sat the rayon militia section chief himself, who thumped the table menacingly: "Watch out! You come and have a talk with me..."

A while later the criminal himself was put on trial: There was not even a mention in the case of the stereo tape recorder.

They tried not to mention what had happened to the Kalalb brothers. Or rather they did not even try--they simply did not mention it, regarding their adventures as the price to be paid in any matter. And who were they, these brothers? One was a "wage slave" and the other "a mere driver." Surely they were not the sort to make trouble? They should be thankful to have gotten off lightly: Whoever it might be, you can always find something to charge him with. Isn't that what they say?

I remember it was the year 1982.

We met a year later. I well remember that evening, the howling blizzard outside, Viktor with his rapid movements and scoffing manner, and the reliable Anatoliy Stepanovich with his ruddy cheeks.

The men who came to us were not supplicants, tormented in their struggle for justice and broken in that struggle, but people tempered in battle, convinced that it was not only their personal honor and worth which were involved in this dirty story. That it was not only with regard to them that the law had been violated--it is not normal in society if tyranny is considered for some people to be not a very grave social anomaly but some kind of norm, rule, and yardstick of social life.

They had already written to Moscow, but the letter had been sent to Kiev and from there to Dnepropetrovsk. A familiar whirligig!

"The search was carried out in accordance with the law...", "items were confiscated with reason...", "no unlawful actions were discovered to have ben

committed against you...," "there was no confirmation that a search had been carried out illegally during the checking process..."

How many forms to fill in, how many stamps, how many signatures! I remember, as I wrote the names and posts of the Dnepropetrovsk law enforcement chiefs into my notebook (what a word—/law/ [word between slantlines published in italics] enforcement!) I was thinking: What were they defending in scribbling this blatant forgery? Their own negligent subordinates? Their own position? Or were they convinced they were defending Soviet power? And against whom? Against a worker and a driver? And what were they counting on?... On the brothers stopping, bewitched by the magic of their posts and official stamps? That they would shrug in despair? That they would, finally, take fright: "What, don't you know who you are threatening?"

That is, in creating and signing a forgery they were counting on the slavish mentality of those for whom the forgery was intended.

A major legal scholar, a member of various councils and commissions, once told me, laughing:

"When a man comes toward me in militia uniform I cross the street just in case."

"Perhaps your sense of the law is overdeveloped," I tried to joke.

"No, it's genetic. I am already over 60, you can't put it right," the scholar sighed.

That conversation will not leave my memory. Look how long everything drags on and how difficult it is to break those "genes!"

What does an innocent man have to fear today, it might seem? What he has to fear is evidently that an innocent man can easily be turned into a guilty one. He won't complain anyway and even if he does there is a whole paperwork system designed to ensure that every argument receives the reply: "It was not confirmed in the checking process." This whirligig twists so much that you will curse the day you found yourself on it—it is better to endure, to forget it as though it were a bad dream, to smile ingratiatingly just in case: Perhaps the danger will pass.

Yet we are nonetheless inseparable from our time. Both then and now I am convinced that the Kalalb brothers' persistence is explained by the fact that the elder brother's youth was in the mid-fifties and the younger grew up during the sixties. That is, they grew up with the certainty that there is not and cannot be any justification for even the slightest tyranny. Their "genes" were not affected and they therefore felt they had within them the strength to resist not only lawlessness but also the bureaucratic law which can justify this lawlessness by "the process of checking" carried out without rising from one's chair.

On the day we met at the editorial office they had already won. Or nearly won. Their persistent appeals to the central organs had begun to break the oblast "law enforcement" wall. Within a year replies began to come from Kiev. First that "handcuffs were used illegally." Then that "some of the objects confiscated during the search" had indeed been lost. Then, finally, that "the decision of the Kirovskiy Rayon people's court has been repealed."

There followed vague words about "bringing charges against the culprits."

But the culprits meanwhile felt fine and, when they accidentally met with Anatoliy Stepanovich on the street, they would stare at him mockingly.

The Kalalb brothers' persistence led to the point where a belated admission that they were in the right was thrown to them like a bone: Only stop, for God's sake! We are tired of wasting official paper on you!

Well, the brothers had known from the outset they were in the right. It was something else that bothered them. Why had a situation of lawlessness and tyranny become possible in principle? And if lawlessness is not considered a crime and the people capable of lawlessness are not considered criminals, then who would give guarantees that another innocent man would not be handcuffed and that articles would not be removed from another house?!

"Is that the way we do things in the Ukraine?" I remember one of the brothers saying with a bitter laugh.

We sat up late that night, wondering what to do next. With our lawyer, whom readers probably know—Ilya Emmanuilovich Kaplun—we decided to appeal personally to the USSR minister of internal affairs: The story should finally be ended!

A letter was sent the next day. Perhaps because it was no longer 1982 but 1983 (we recall our first hopes!) or because for the first time the complaint was not sent off to Kiev, and so on down the line, a special commission arrived in Dnepropetrovsk from Moscow. When early in 1984 an answer came from the USSR MVD we in the editorial office felt the joy of victory.

I have also kept this reply in my archives. USSR Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs K. B. Vostrikov announced:

"The letter was checked on the spot. It was established that on 2 October 1982 A. S. Kalalb was taken without sufficient grounds to the Kirovskiy Rayispolkom internal affairs section in Dnepropetrovsk, was unlawfully charged, was illegally kept in solitary confinement during his arrest, and was handcuffed without justification. His brother V. S. Kalalb was also unlawfully charged and fined R50... The culprits have been strictly disciplined for the violations of legality they committed, right up to dismissal from the internal affairs organs. The Dnepropetrovsk oblispolkom internal affairs administration has been instructed to examine within 10 days the question of compensation for the material damage caused to the Kalalb brothers. Materials

relating to the gross violations of socialist legality have been sent to the Dnepropetrovsk prosecutor to charge former militia workers in accordance with the law."

There is a date and a signature. And "right up to dismissal" and "former workers" and "charge in accordance with the law."

It was then, in 1984, that I put my uncompleted manuscript in the bottom drawer of my desk: Was it worth fulminating when justice had triumphed anyway and evil had been punished, as they say? And in the end it was not half a column in the newspaper but a short letter sent from the editorial office which proved sufficient for that.

Later I encountered other situations in my life and I had to drive or fly somewhere, to hurry, sometimes to win, sometimes on the contrary to stop in front of the latest impenetrable wall.

In general, time passed. But the Dnepropetrovsk story was not forgotten and sometimes, at particularly difficult times, I would remember it. I would remember it, persuading myself that we were nonetheless not working in vain and that there was some point to the endless whirl of my days.

Sometimes I received brief letters from Dnepropetrovsk from Anatoliy Stepanovich or from Surgut from Viktor—mostly festive greetings. And I would answer them just as briefly. I did not ask about past matter, because I was confident that the wave raised by the letter from the newspaper had long since crushed all the culprits. That it had really crushed them: not with phony sentences and hasty pensionings off, not by moving chairs—from prosecutor to lawyer, from investigator to staff legal adviser. Really crushed them—removing them from the tribe of lawyers. After all, "charged in accordance with the law" is not to be toyed with. Encroaching on a person's honor and dignity is no joke.

I was confident that justice had triumphed and, to be honest, this confidence gladdened and supported me. Particularly when in other cases I did not succeed in achieving even elementary success, either by a letter from the newspaper or by an article in the newspaper:

It turned out there was nothing to be glad about.

Here is what Anatoliy Stepanovich Kalalb wrote in January of this year, 1987 (I quote the letter in full):

"I want to tell you about the fate of the dramatis personae of our story as of today.

"1. Vasilii Fedorovich Sokolan, former Kirovskiy Rayon prosecutor. It was he who made it possible to perpetrate lawlessness and tyranny. The commission from the USSR MVD frankly told me that Sokolan had been /found guilty/ [words

between slantlines published in italics] of this. Right now he is deputy prosecutor of the Dnepr railroad.

"2. Nikolay Ivanovich Zhitskiy, former Kirovskiy Rayon deputy prosecutor. He was the one who shouted at me: 'But what did you want? We'll put you in prison again!' After that he was promoted—he was made Samarskiy Rayon prosecutor. He is now in prison, convicted of bribery on particularly large scales. He was sentenced to 7 years.

"3. Nikolay Dmitriyevich Poronko, chief of the Rayon Internal Affairs section, who headed and gave his blessing to the illegal search. He then sat next to the judge when I was sentenced to 15 days' imprisonment. He was calmly transferred as deputy chief to another militia institution.

"4. Yevgeniy Akimovich Dudchenko, deputy chief of the rayon internal affairs section for operations. The order was to dismiss him from the internal affairs organs, but in actual fact they dragged their feet and sent him on 'well-earned' vacation.

"5. Boris Anisimovich Stratiy, senior duty officer. This total scoundrel searched me at the rayon internal affairs section, took my watch, my handkerchief, R1.6, and my sunglasses. After that he began to abuse me and when I made repeated demands to call the rayon prosecutor threatened to expel me from the CPSU. Eventually he was quietly pensioned off.

"6. Arkadiy Vladimirovich Pozdnaynskiy. Former chief of the Kirovskiy Rayon internal affairs section investigation department. He found work as a lawyer at a wine factory, collected positive character references, and became a lawyer at a legal consultation service.

"7. Vladimir Nikolayevich Trush. The investigator who carried out the illegal search without the approval of the prosecutor. He was dismissed from the militia for bringing the internal affairs organs into disrepute. He was the one who forged the signatures of the witnesses on the search warrant, illegally gathered up articles and items of food, and so forth. He was the one who gave the order for me to be handcuffed and placed under guard. He is now working as a lawyer at the "Kirovskiy" sovkhov, Dnepropetrovskiy Rayon. As sovkhov lawyer he has continued his illegal actions. The sovkhov director has been dismissed and expelled from the party and so has the party committee secretary. Trush has come up smelling of roses, having a large amount of support from someone.

"8. Sergey Sergeyevich Kostritsa, former criminal investigation inspector. He was the one who shaved himself with my razor (while I was chained to the radiator) and ate everything in sight. He was the one who stole items which were unloaded in the basement of the rayon internal affairs department. I do not know what has become of him since. After being dismissed he spent a lot of time wandering through the city, trying to order 100-gramme shots of vodka at snack bars. No criminal charges were brought against him.

"9. Vladimir Ovchinnikov. I don't know his patronymic. A former sector inspector. He was dismissed from the internal affairs organs. He was the one who drew up the warrant and sent me to court, although he had never set eyes on me. He is now working as a senior supervisor at the railroad.

"10. Viktor Alekseyevich Zanosiyenko, oblast deputy prosecutor and chief of the investigation administration. He was the one who gave unfounded replies full of lies and slander. He was the one who created the nutrient medium for those who tried to prove what could not be proved. He has now been very slightly demoted (but not because of me, of course)—he has been transferred to the city prosecutor's office.

"11. Viktor Vyacheslavovich Malikovskiy, former chief of the internal affairs administration investigation administration. He was the one who defended and covered his subordinates and gave the order not to issue a copy of the search warrant. Yet when he learned that a commission had come from the USSR MVD he personally brought the search warrant to my home. But I did not open the door to him. I had nothing to say to him since the commission had already come. He is now working as deputy chief of the Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon internal affairs department. For what services, I should like to know?

"That is what I have been wanting to write to you about for a long time, but I kept thinking that something would change at our end."

I read the letter—and how incensed I was! I immediately remembered as clearly as though it had been the day before that day in February 1984 when I last saw Anatoliy Stepanovich. I remember how the door of our room opened, how he entered—big, broad-shouldered, pink-faced from the frosty weather—and said: "Four colonels came from Moscow, they found me at home, we spent 3 hours talking, and they said that they had never before seen such lawlessness," then he muttered: "Thanks to the newspaper" and did something I remember even now with a feeling of embarrassment: He suddenly bowed from the waist. "What are you doing, Anatoliy Stepanovich!" I remember leaping up. "Then I will bow to you now and that way we will be bowing to each other..." Then we had a long talk about how the country was moving toward normal social relations, that the scum would have to get used to the idea... We shared our hopes for bright changes...

That is why the letter I received in early January so perturbed me.

I suddenly wondered what would have happened if Anatoliy Stepanovich had taken this letter round the local bodies. what kind of looks he would have gotten? Surprised looks?... "Well, so you've remembered! So do you expect us to drop everything now and deal with your story which is only worth spitting on and forgetting?" Or indignant looks? "Just think, you spent 15 days in prison? And you're still after blood? Isn't it enough for you that the investigation inspector is wandering through the city begging for 100 grammes of vodka? Is it for you to decide how to punish him?" Or warning looks, just to be on the safe side?... "We'll looking into it, check it out, and find out?" Only to forget immediately who to check out and what to find out. Or utterly

uncomprehending looks? "What are you making a fuss about, what do you want?.."

How and when did it happen that the humiliation of a specific person and the violation of his human rights began to be measured against the life of the country?! Our achievements, it is claimed, are one thing, but specific human destinies are something quite different, of a different order, so to speak. Why interfere? Why raise an outcry about some individual occurrence?!

This "wide-scale" thinking has cost us dear. It has resulted in stagnation phenomena, has distorted social awareness, and introduced a dual morality into society.

So has this main lesson of the past not proved to be nothing more than an unnecessary burden for some people, a burden which is a hindrance if it is constantly being mentioned?

That is why I fear an indifferent reaction to Anatoliy Stepanovich's January 1987 letter.

Yet in this letter Anatoliy Stepanovich talks about something very important and significant. Are we to believe or not believe in restructuring in our own city, oblast, or republic, if people who discredited themselves yesterday, despite all the winds of change, have simply changed their posts and duties? Surely that is not restructuring? Are they then restructuring themselves "from within?" And for themselves? That is, you form the impression that offices and posts are simply being shuffled like a deck of cards but with the same jacks, the same kings, and the same aces...

That, I think, is what Anatoliy Stepanovich had in mind when he wrote: "All the time I was thinking that something would change at our end..."

Restructuring is a struggle and, as in any struggle, there must be losers as well as winners in it. These are not sport contests whose only result can be the feeble consolation that "there has been a victory for friendship!"

Otherwise we run the risk of hearing from the selfsame mouths of those selfsame people who have discredited themselves hasty reports about "the victorious completion of restructuring."

/9599

CSO: 1800/304

SOCIAL ISSUES

ACADEMICS RAPPED FOR SHUNNING STUDY OF BUREAUCRACY

PH131053 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Jan 86 Second Edition p 1

["Letter to the Paper" by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V. Kosyakov: "What Do We Know About Bureaucrats?"]

[Text] Moscow—As a sociologist whose dissertation was devoted to public openness and criticism, I wondered about the following question: To what extent has the problem of combating bureaucracy in our society been scientifically studied? It is well known that the 27th Party Congress specially indicated in its resolution the need to step up the struggle against bureaucracy. I decided to ask a number of specialist social scientists in Moscow. I must admit that the answers I received filled me with perplexity. But judge for yourselves.

"The theme of bureaucracy does not feature in the plans for research work at our institute" was the clear and concise answer to my question from V.N. Ivanov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research. "You'd be better off putting the question to the USSR Academy of Science Institute of the State and Law."

"The theme of bureaucracy does not feature in the institute's plans" was what I heard from Doctor of Juridical Sciences Prof A.M. Vasilyev, deputy director of the Institute of the State and Law.

"The plans make no mention of not only the theme but also the very term 'bureaucracy,'" the institute's academic secretary, V.V. Yegorov, who was taking part in the conversation, explained.

"It cannot be said," Andrey Mikhaylovich continued, "that no one in our institute is studying the problem of bureaucracy. B.M. Lazarev, M.I. Piskotin, and a number of other specialists at the institute are studying bureaucracy indirectly, in connection with other problems of state management. In general," the institute deputy director concluded, "bureaucracy is a negative social phenomenon and so I think sociologists ought to study it."

Doctor of Juridical Sciences B.M. Lazarev, secretary of the institute party organization and chief of the Administrative Law Sector, noted: "Bureaucracy requires serious academic analysis."

The USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy is almost opposite the Institute of the State and Law, just across the street.

"So far as I know," Academician T.I. Oyzerman said, "no one in our institute is studying the problem of bureaucracy. What's so surprising? It is a politically controversial topic. Philosophers are afraid of touching it..."

S.I. Mosyagin, deputy director of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Research Institute, would not agree to a meeting.

"I don't want to talk as one private individual to another. I can't talk in an official capacity, you don't have the appropriate authorization to talk with me. As for research into the problem of bureaucracy, I would note that we mostly study and generalize leading experience of party work, so the theme of bureaucracy does not feature at our institute."

Thus one of the most dangerous negative phenomena that the party congress called on us to combat remains virgin territory for Soviet social scientists. How come all these nursemaids have failed to keep an eye on such a strapping child? Lone enthusiasts can scarcely substantially help matters: The problem is very complex and requires serious and united efforts.

Where and in what sphere could specialist social scientists, and sociologists in particular, help in the struggle against bureaucracy?

I think a sociological analysis of working people's letters to state, Soviet, and party organs complaining about red tape, formalism, and chicanery on the part of officials of differing rank and status could offer a great deal. It may be objected that such an analysis is already carried out. True, but this is usually done only occasionally, and it would be good to switch to careful, systematic sociological study of the nature and content of letters and the motives and reasons behind working people's appeals. After all, if sociologists had carefully analyzed working people's complaints about arrogance and indifference on the part of public health personnel in Moscow and shortcomings in the capital's trade sphere, there could have been considerably less trouble in these spheres.

Why not carefully study the practice of organizing the reception of citizens by officials? No one has yet precisely computed how much time people waste outside the doors of official offices or the toll on their health and nerves.

Nowadays sociologists are usually out of touch with management organs, but they ought to go hand in hand. It is futile to combat bureaucracy at home, in the quiet of reading rooms. The sociologist must act where the danger of bureaucracy is clearest—in organs of state management, the apparatus of various sectors and departments, law enforcement organs, and, of course, Soviet ispolkoms and their sections and services.

/12913

CSO: 1800/316

REGIONAL ISSUES

MOLDAVIA'S MOKANU ANSWERS IZVESTIYA ARTICLE ON MSSR CORRUPTION

PM281141 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jan 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by A. Moku, chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, under the "After IZVESTIYA Item" rubric: "Lessons and Assessments"]

[Text] At a session on 9 January 1987 the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium discussed the article "So Where Was the Prosecutor?" published in this newspaper [IZVESTIYA 2 December 1986]. The resolution which was adopted noted that the article raised a whole series of topical questions of a principled nature connected with serious omissions which had occurred in the activity of the republic's soviets of people's deputies, their ispolkoms and their law enforcement organs in ensuring socialist legality and organizing the struggle against exaggerated data and window-dressing and other negative phenomena. Instances of exaggerated data and window-dressing and the unseemly practice of duping the state, which have become so widespread in the republic and which were sternly denounced by the CPSU Central Committee and the fourth plenum of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, are largely explained by the fact that, as rightly emerges from the article, the leaders of a number of soviet ispolkoms had long been displaying a lack of principle and "localistic patriotism," had been placing the creation of a semblance that all was well above the crux and interests of the matter, had been slack in exercising leadership of controlling and administrative organs, and had failed to render due assistance to the prosecutor's office organs as required by legislation on the soviets of people's deputies.

Substantial shortcomings were allowed in the practice of some local soviets in resolving questions of giving consent to criminal charges being brought against deputies and to the arrest or application of administrative sanctions and the desire to defend someone who has been fined and to shield him from responsibility. Thus not only were the solution of questions and the examination of matters delayed but moral and ethical harm was also inflicted.

In 1981-1984 exaggerated data, window-dressing, and the abuse of official position were widespread in Glodyanskiy Rayon. Over this period the fulfillment of the sales plan was exaggerated to the tune of 1,184 metric tons of meat, 40 metric tons of milk, and over 1 million eggs, for which many workers, including several farm leaders, had criminal charges brought against them and were convicted.

The article rightly noted instances of exaggerated data and the gross distortion of statistical reports in Chimishliyskiy Rayon.

The leaders of the Kirov and Shevchenko kolkhozes, the "Patriya" kolkhoz, and the K. Marx and Michurin kolkhozes allowed a reduction in the cow population, a decline in the herd's productivity and the number of calves born, the writing off of milk as having been fed to the calves, exaggerated reports on the production of green leaf tobacco, and various other machinations. The distortion of the real state of affairs also occurred in other sectors. The existence of these negative phenomena is explained by the fact that no clear-cut system had been worked out in the rayon for the coordination of the actions of the soviet, monitoring [kontroliruyushchiye], and administrative organs and that executive discipline was low.

The rayispolkom, called on to ensure socialist legality and to intercept any violations of or deviations from the law, displayed totally unjustified passivity and failed to react promptly and efficiently to violations of laws in economic activity.

Resolutions of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers, Moldavian republican trade unions council, and Moldavian Komsomol Central Committee have expelled Chimishliyskiy Rayon from the ranks of those awarded challenge red banners, honorary certificates, diplomas, and money prizes for the exaggerations and distortions in its report figures.

Instances of exaggerated data and window-dressing which have occurred in the rayon were sternly and sharply denounced at the rayon soviet session held in an atmosphere of the constructive discussion of shortcomings and of measures to eradicate them. Specific measures were elaborated to step up the activity of the soviet and its organs in this direction. At the same time the ispolkom failed to pay sufficient attention to preparing sessions of the settlement soviet and rural soviets and holding them at the appropriate level. Many local soviet sessions failed to give a principled assessment of negative phenomena and their decisions and measures are of a general nature and are only made for effect.

The soviets of people's deputies of Faleshtakiy Rayon failed to adopt a proper principled position in the struggle against exaggerated data and distortions of the true state of affairs, nor has the rayispolkom set them an example of principledness, consistency, and resoluteness in defending state interests and social justice. In 1981 the rayispolkom (the former chairman was Ye. G. Porchesku) was essentially the organizer of the purchase of wine from the population for subsequent crediting as allegedly harvested grapes. An atmosphere of permissiveness and of deception of the state was created in the rayon.

The soviets of people's deputies and their ispolkoms failed to pay due attention to the work of the organs of people's control, statistics, and finances and the departments of the USSR Gosbank and USSR All-Union Bank for Financing Capital Investments, which were unable to erect a solid barrier

against distortions of state accountability and failed to ensure the prompt revelation and halting of such instances or an in-depth analysis of the checks carried out and the reports accepted.

A pernicious style of leadership, a tolerant attitude toward instances of the deception of the state, and sometimes direct connivance with these instances on the part of the soviets of people's deputies and their ispolkoms have not helped to create locally an atmosphere of openness and vigorous struggle against phenomena which have caused tremendous moral harm to the republic and have prevented resolute and fruitful work by the prosecutors, who have not always met with understanding and support.

At the same time the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium noted that the article also correctly mentions the insufficiently vigorous activity of the prosecutors of individual rayons and their unprincipledness, lack of initiative, and frequently inertia in combatting negative phenomena. Some of them were under the thumb of leaders and adopted the stance of detached observers, a stance of nonintervention, which attests to the inadequate level of leadership exercised over them by the republic's Prosecutor's Office.

The Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium recognized that the article "So Where Was the Prosecutor?" published in IZVESTIYA was correct and promoted the further activation of the struggle launched in the republic since the adoption of the CPSU Central Committee resolution and the fourth Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee plenum against exaggerated data, window-dressing, and the deception of the state as it also promoted the assertion of an atmosphere of fairness and truthfulness and the consolidation of socialist legality, and it strictly denounced instances which had occurred in the activity of the Moldavian SSR soviets of people's deputies and their organs involving connivance, unprincipledness, and the failure to adopt resolute measures to halt violations of the requirements of legislation in economic activity, exaggerated data, distortions of the true state of affairs, and the creation of a semblance of all being well and of the state plans having been fulfilled.

It has been taken into consideration that many leading cadres mentioned in the article have been relieved of their posts and have been suitably punished. The question of the responsibility of Comrade P. M. Grichuk, chairman of the Chimishliyskiy Rayispolkom, for the unprincipledness allowed in assessing instances of exaggerated data and window-dressing in the rayon will be examined when he returns from leave.

The Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has obliged the republic's rayon and city soviets to make fuller and broader use of their powers in resolving the tasks of stepping up the struggle against violations of the requirements of Soviet laws, thriftlessness, extravagance, exaggerated data, and window-dressing, to enlist working people more vigorously to the management of state and public affairs and the exercise of control over the activity of state organs and officials, and to pay more attention to preventive activity.

The Moldavian SSR Central Statistical Administration, the Moldavian SSR Ministry of Finances, and the Moldavian republican offices of the USSR Gosbank and USSR All-Union Bank for Financing Capital Investments have been instructed to step up the leadership of the local organizations under their jurisdiction, to improve the standard of their analytical and monitoring activity, to ensure the careful study and verification of submitted reports, to render them effective aid in setting up reporting, and to prevent distortions of statistical reports. More attention must be paid to educating cadres in a spirit of principledness, persistence, and high responsibility for the matter in hand.

The Presidium obliged the republic's law enforcement organs to step up the struggle against law violations and crime, to promptly impose the sanctions provided for by law on all culprits, irrespective of the posts they hold, ensuring the full implementation of the constitutional principle of citizens' equality before the law, to take specific steps to eliminate the reasons and conditions promoting the commission of law violations, and to resolutely overcome any localistic and departmental influences.

It has been recommended to the Moldavian SSR Prosecutor's Office that it step up the prosecutor's supervision over the precise and uniform execution of the laws by all state organs, public organizations, officials, and citizens.

/9599

CSO: 1800/305

REGIONAL ISSUES

ESTONIAN DESCRIBES TRIAL OF WAR CRIMINALS

Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian 4 Dec 86 p 4

[Text] The readers already know that recently U.S. authorities satisfied a repeated demand submitted by the Soviet Government to hand over the war criminal Karl Linnas. Also that is known that during the fascist occupation Karl Linnas was the head at the Tartu concentration camp, where at least 12,000 people were executed. For this, the Estonian SSR Supreme Court sentenced him in 1962 to death. But the United States Government tried to the last moment to save the war criminal, offered him an opportunity to leave the USA. Likewise it is known that several countries, to which Linnas applied, refused to give him asylum.

Then---justice won.

During the intervening years a new generation of readers has grown up to whom the name of Linnas does not mean very much. But making an acquaintanceship with his activity provides an answer also to some such questions which are not directly reflected in diplomatic documents and legal records of the court...

...It was June and July of 1941. The Great Fatherland War had begun. All progressive men supported the heroic fight of the Soviet people against the fascist usurper.

But Karl Linnas was in the gang of those bandits, who, led by Major Kurg, cleared the way for fascist forces in Tartu city and country. Even before the creation of the "new order," they put into operation there a bloody terror. Rapturously they welcomed the SS-Hauptsturmführer Kurt von Glasenapp, a former Baltic baron. A ribbon was cut for the baron's chest from a three-coloured, blue-black-white [Estonian national colours] strip of cloth.

The aide-de-camp to President Pats of bourgeois Estonia, Friedrich Kurg, became commandant of Tartu city. He immediately appointed Juhan Juriste as head of the Tartu concentration camp, and several months later, in his place, Karl Linnas, an orderly officer at the same camp who had caught one's eye with his diligence. The establishment of the concentration camp was indeed the first undertaking of the "new power" in Tartu.

The two heads of the Tartu concentration camp and Ervin Viiks who had operated at the same camp were then tried for crimes by the Estonian SSR Supreme Court in January 1962.

A question could arise: why, for all that, so late? The crimes of fascists in Tartu became clear, after all, quite soon after liberation.

The reason is simple. Juriste had managed to conceal himself in Estonia, living under a false name, and the whereabouts of Linnaas was learned only in 1960. (Several underlings of the fascists, who had served at the Tartu camp, had already received their punishment earlier. Some of them had finished serving their punishment and appeared at the Juriste-Linnaas-Viks trial as witnesses.)

Already in February and October of 1961, immediately after ascertaining the crimes of Linnaas and Viks, the Soviet Government presented notes to U.S. and Australian authorities for handing them over in accordance with the "Declaration with regard to Hitlerite accountability for crimes to be committed," which was signed on 30 October 1943, and in accordance with the 1946 and 1947 resolutions of the UN General Assembly, on the basis of which war criminals had to be handed over to the country where they committed the crimes.

The Australian Government at that time looked for all kinds of excuses for not fulfilling the UN recommendation. But the USA already then used its favourite method--also breaking such agreements, signed by a representative of the U.S. Government himself.

Thus, then, the chairs at the Tartu trial meant for Linnaas and Viks remained empty.

In a summary of the accusation and the court sentence, which was also made known to the U.S. authorities, the crimes of Linnaas have been put laconically in writing:

- while head of the concentration camp (from August 1941 to May 1942) Linnaas organized, in accordance with the guidelines of the German occupants, together with the heads of the "special department" established at the camp, mass extermination of Soviet citizens;
- directed concentration camp officers and guards who systematically...took to the side of an anti-tank trench and there shot dead Soviet citizens, where among the thousands shot dead there were feeble old persons, women, small children and sick persons;
- drove repeatedly to the shooting place and directed the guards who were killing people, where he himself with pistol shots put an end to prisoners who by chance had remained alive;
- as a head of the concentration camp, enforced at the camp a savage regime, as a consequence of which Soviet citizens had to do work exceeding their strength, suffered hunger, were in difficult, anti-sanitary conditions, were without medical aid, had to suffer beatings, torture and mocking by guards; but women, in addition to that, rape.

- was personally beating prisoners and mocked them.

The records of the trial which lasted for five days given an appreciably more monstrous picture than the brief summary of the accusation. With regard to rage, arbitrariness and mockings one could hardly find anything like the Tartu camp. It would indeed be more proper to call it not a concentration camp but a death camp.

People whom the Omakaitse [Self-Defence; a military organization in Estonia] men had carried together according to their discretion from the town and civil rural parishes were brought together to the former Naituse Valjak [Exhibition Square]. By the tens and hundreds. And likewise by tens and hundreds they were taken to be shot. The commission determining punishments, which was headed by Roland Lepik and in whose complement the head of the camp belonged, decided as a matter of course over the life or death of people. Sometimes the accused was called out; in most cases an accusation sufficed: a supporter of Soviet power. People were taken to the side of the anti-tank trench to be shot even without a formal sentence. They were sent to the "death hut," and that was all. Frequently by families: women, children, feeble old persons. It is difficult to understand why members of the Tartu University's teaching staff, professors Rubel, Kliiman and Silberstein were killed. The last one had come to Tartu from Czechoslovakia, a Tolstoyan in his views, a democratic liberal, as many other bourgeois educated persons. For what reasons were Mall, Talvik, Kaosaar, Dr. Saarse, Professor Tarvel and others detained at the camp? A land surveyor was killed because, in accordance with orders, he surveyed the land for the new settlers. A youngster was acknowledged a communist because he was not in the Kaitseliit [Defence Union; Estonian home guard organization].

But let former subordinates of Linnas himself speak by way of court records. Nobody knew better than they the mechanism of the death-conveyer and they hardly wanted to depict the camp more dreadful than it actually was:

Guard of the concentration camp Laats: "In the beginning getting into the camp was very simple. Those to be detained were all who were suspected of awaiting Soviet power. Simply on the street somebody could point out with his finger that there was a communist, and that one who was pointed out was immediately detained. For the most part, those to be detained were Estonians, there were fewer Russians. Jews were detained at the Aleksandri Tanav schoolhouse and they were taken to be shot by way of the Naituse Valjak camp.

Later prisoners were brought by means of the security police from the local civil parish administration houses and from other centres. They were brought to the camp, and the majority was shot.

The shooting took place 2-3 times a day. (According to statements by other witnesses, even 6-7 times.) They were taken with one and two motor vehicles, 15-20 people in a motor vehicle.

It was made known to the head of the guard team, when the taking away would take place, and the guard team formed a semicircle around the hut. Then the head of the camp and the head of the special department came with lists of names.

In the beginning the hands of prisoners were not tied. Later hands were tied and the prisoners were tied at a-metre-and-a-half distance to a rope. The prisoners were driven along steps into the motor vehicle and were made to sit at the two sides of the motor vehicle loading bodies. All this took place forcibly. There were kicks and hits with rifle butts. (As an observation: the nickname of one of the binders was Luumurdja [Bone Breaker], because when tying he smashed wrist bones.)

Shootings were usually directed by Linnas, Viks or Koolmeister. Before being taken to be shot the prisoners were undressed. Especially when Jews were being sent to be shot. Then employees from the bookkeepers congregated by those to be executed; even women, who came in search of loot.

After the guard team's joint salvo by the grave, overshooting was done; Linnas and Viks fired, in addition, at the corpses fallen into the grave or at those half-dead...

The children staying at the Aleksandri Tanav schoolhouse were taken by way of the camp to be shot. The bigger ones were taken together with parents, the smaller ones were taken separately. There were 3-4 men for taking and executing the children. One guard boasted when drunk that he had taken a child by its leg and killed him by a shot in the head.

There was a great deal of alcohol, and during the shooting those firing were drunk. There was no kind of humaneness, they did it as a ditch-digging or wood-chopping job. One evening women were being taken to be shot, and the next day it was being spoken that the drunken guards in the motor vehicle raped them.

Frequently they drove by a motor vehicle from the town to the camp's special department. Among those travelling were German officers. Viks, Lepik and Linnas were taken with them and they drove to orgies. For this women from the camp were taken with them. Many of them were later killed. They were raped also at the special department.

Linnas was arrogant, haughty and proud at the camp, at the same time he was toadying at any price to the fascists and tried to crawl to every one of their orgies."

Guard of the concentration camp Kolberg: "In the morning a person happened to get into the camp, but by evening he was already shot dead and the guards walked around his clothes.

The organizers of shootings were lieutenant Linnas and Juriste."

Karikosk, a guard who was at the camp for approximately 3 weeks: "At one time Linnas ordered that I should travel with him. Thus indeed I came to see how a group of Jewish women were forcibly driven into a bus, where clothes were torn off them. Among them were elderly ones, one nearly 70. There were also children. All were tied with one string. When we arrived at the side of the trench they were dragged out of the motor vehicle. Some were naked, because

drunk guards had undressed them completely on the way. One guard had raped a female prisoner in the bus in the sight of everybody...

Frequently orgies were organized and always the ringleaders were Linnas and Juriste."

The stories about shootings are complemented by the people who had lived near the anti-tank trench. They told about children who were not yet able to walk on their own legs, about screams and shouting, for the muffling of which motor vehicle engines were started up. After that, cheerful laughter of those who were shooting was heard, who, singing "patriotic songs," were crawling into motor vehicles. But with spring flood-water in the trench, the corpses were floating, because the drunk guards did not even care about properly filling in the trench.

Thus, by the end of 1941 approximately 8,000 people were killed. Killings continued also later, when the camp had moved from the Naituse Valjak to the Kastani Tanav.

Description of the situation prevailing at the camp would mean repeating all that we have read from many memoirs and literary works with regard to fascist concentration camps. In the course of five days the hall full of people heard hundreds of tragedies about which the prisoners of the concentration camp, who had remained alive, were telling.

Juhan Juriste, Karl Linnas and Ervin Viks were sentenced to death. The hall-full of people received the sentence with approval. Both before the trial, during the court sessions and also later hundreds of letters and telegrams arrived at the editorial offices of newspapers and court organs, in which the crimes of the underlings of fascists were condemned.

Juhan Juriste received the deserved punishment.

After the trial and also later the Soviet Government repeatedly applied to the U.S. authorities, demanding the handing over of Linnas. The nerves of several of the mass murderers, whose crimes in the native land had been exposed, did not stand up and they ended their lives in suicide. The nerves of Linnas were stronger, or he had found for himself better protectors.

Reactionary newspapers of the West tried to present the administration of justice on the mass murderers as if it was organized only for propaganda purposes. The Estonian emigre press saw in the administration of justice altogether slander of the "Estonian freedom fighters," and described the accused as "innocent sufferers, victims of communism." But when it was not possible to conceal the truth, it was maintained that since it was under the occupation only "some individual unfounded excesses" had taken place. Splendid individual occurrences, in the course of which more than 125,000 people were killed in Estonia, of them more than 61,000 local inhabitants.

One of the main characteristics of nationalist bourgeois activity was the betrayal of their people and mass murders. Chauvenism does not mean only hatred and destruction of other nations, but also betrayal and killing of one's own people. This was shown by the occupation years and also shown by the story of the Tartu concentration camp and its leaders.

Who then gave the murders of Tartu his blessing?

This was done by his aid-de-camp Friedrich Kurg, as it were, directly in the name of the bourgeois Estonian President Pats, who appointed as head of the camp Juriste, and later Linnas.

The head of the special department which determined punishments, who boasted that at the Naituse Valjak he despatched to another world more than 8,000 people, was Roland Lepik, who previously worked as Tartu department secretary of the Isamaal it [Fatherland Union; a political organization in Estonia].

For consideration, material is also being offered by the biography of Karl Linnas himself. In 1937 he had finished Gymnasium with very good grades and had in the same year entered the university. But then he exchanged this for the military school of the bourgeois army. At the secondary school he belonged to the "Noored Kotkad" ["Young Eagles"; an organization of boys in Estonia] organization, at the university to the chauvinistic "Vironia" ["corporation" of students]. Its share was provided by the bourgeois military school. From there one indeed has to search for the roots which made out of a 22-year-old youngster a mass murderer. At the Tartu death camp other members of student fraternities also served as guards and officers.

There has nothing to do with "individual unfounded excesses," as it is being endeavoured to maintain, but with the development of the natural course of events.

It is also of a likewise natural course of events that with pressure from the public at large the U.S. authorities had at last to adopt a resolution to hand over Linnas.

ARNO KALLACK

/9716
CSO: 1815/20

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

2 APRIL 87